

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, January 17, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I request a roll call in order to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Ashurst	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Austin	Ellender	Lewis	Sheppard
Bailey	Frazier	Lodge	Shipstead
Bankhead	George	Logan	Smathers
Barbour	Gerry	Lucas	Smith
Barkley	Gibson	Lundeen	Stewart
Bilbo	Gillette	McCarran	Taft
Bone	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Green	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Guffey	Maloney	Tobey
Brown	Gurney	Mead	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hill	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Davis	King	Russell	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF MONETARY POWERS UNTIL JANUARY 15, 1941

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1939.

Hon. JOHN N. GARNER,

President of the United States Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The powers conferred by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, dealing with the stabilization fund, and the powers specified in paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, as amended, relating to the fixing of the metallic content of the dollar, will expire on June 30, 1939.

The existence of these powers has enabled us to safeguard the Nation's interests and to carry forward international monetary and economic cooperation. It is obvious, however, that the international monetary and economic situation is still such that it would not be safe to permit such powers to be terminated. I believe the sound and wise policy to pursue under the circumstances is to extend these powers until January 15, 1941.

The Secretary of the Treasury and other representatives of the Treasury Department will be available to discuss with

the appropriate committees of Congress the problems relating to such legislation.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

REMOVAL OF TAX-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGE FROM GOVERNMENTAL SECURITIES AND SALARIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message of April 25, 1938, I urged that the time had come when the Congress should exercise its constitutional power to tax income from whatever source derived. I urged that the time had come when private income should not be exempt either from Federal or State income tax simply because such private income is derived as interest from Federal, State, or municipal obligations or because it is received as compensation for services rendered to the Federal, State, or municipal governments.

A fair and effective progressive income tax and a huge perpetual reserve of tax-exempt bonds could not exist side by side. Those who earn their livelihood from government should bear the same tax burden as those who earn their livelihood in private employment.

The tax immunities heretofore accorded to private income derived from Government securities or Government employment are not inexorable requirements of the Constitution but are the result of judicial decision. I repeat that it is not unreasonable to hope that judicial decision would permit the elimination of these immunities.

Decisions of the Supreme Court rendered since my message, particularly the decision in the Port of New York Authority case, have made an important and constructive contribution to the elimination of these inequitable immunities.

It is obvious, however, that these inequities cannot be satisfactorily corrected by judicial decisions alone. Without legislation to supplement them, many individuals and corporations will be subjected to tax liabilities for income received in past years which they mistakenly, but in good faith, believed to be tax-exempt. It is evident, for example, that employees of many State agencies as well as the holders of securities of public corporations believed that the income they received from such sources was tax-exempt, in view of the opinions of eminent counsel based upon earlier decisions of the Supreme Court. In the interest of equity and justice, therefore, immediate legislation is required to prevent recent judicial decisions from operating in such a retroactive fashion as to impose tax liability on these innocent employees and investors for salaries heretofore earned or on income derived from securities heretofore issued.

In the light of those decisions there are, among the taxpayers of the Nation, inevitable uncertainties respecting their tax liabilities. There is uncertainty whether the salaries which they receive are not taxable under the existing provisions of the revenue acts; there is uncertainty whether the interest which they receive upon the obligations of governmental instrumentalities is similarly not taxable; and there is an uncertainty whether the salaries and interest which they have received for past years will create an unanticipated source of tax liabilities and penalties.

In view of the fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will have no choice but to enforce our income-tax law as declared in the latest decisions of the Supreme Court, prompt legislation is necessary to safeguard against the inequities to which I have referred. The need, therefore, is for the prompt enactment of equitable rules, prospective in operation, which the Bureau can apply and taxpayers can observe without that mass of litigation which otherwise is to be anticipated. We are confronted with a situation which can be handled with fairness to all and with reasonable administrative convenience only through the cooperation of the Congress and the courts.

Unless the Congress passes some legislation dealing with this situation prior to March 15, I am informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that he will be obliged to collect back taxes for at least 3 years upon the employees of many State agencies and upon the security holders of many State corporate instrumentalities, who mistakenly but in good faith believed they were tax-exempt. The assessment and collection of these taxes will doubtlessly in many instances produce great hardship.

Accordingly I recommend legislation to correct the existing inequitable situation, and at the same time to make private income from all Government salaries hereafter earned and from all Government securities hereafter issued subject to the general income-tax laws of the Nation and of the several States. It is difficult for almost all citizens to understand why a constitutional provision permitting taxes on "income from whatever source derived" does not mean "from whatever source derived."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND THE PHILIPPINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1938, in order to obviate difficulties encountered in administering the fiscal provisions of the act.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State; 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

STATUS OF LANDS OF THE CHOCTAW INDIANS, MISSISSIPPI

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the status of certain lands purchased for the Choctaw Indians, Mississippi, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

OMAHA AND WINNEBAGO INDIANS, NEBRASKA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the benefit of the Omaha and Winnebago Indians, Nebraska, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LOANS TO INDIAN CHARTERED CORPORATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of loans to Indian chartered corporations for the purpose of promoting the economic development of tribes and their members, and two reports showing the status of credit operations as of June 30, 1938, and November 30, 1938, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, ex officio chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, trans-

mitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the associate commissioner of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., stating, in response to Senate Resolution 285, agreed to June 8, 1938, that no aliens are employed by the corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from the executive officer of the Alley Dwelling Authority, District of Columbia, stating, in response to Senate Resolution 285, agreed to June 8, 1938, that no aliens are employed by the Authority, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

BOARD OF SURVEY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a board of survey of the District of Columbia water system looking toward the completion of the system not later than 1950, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from the international executive board of the United Automobile Workers of America, of Detroit, Mich., praying that Congress appropriate \$875,000,000, as originally proposed by the President, for the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Stanley Odom, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate money for a claim arising from an injury to his son, Stanley Lee Odom, on a Works Progress Administration project, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by members of the Republican Club of the fifteenth assembly district of the city and State of New York, favoring continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities (House of Representatives), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the St. Simon School (conducted by the Sisters of Mercy), of Ludington, Mich., praying for the preservation of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition signed by 400 farmers of Sumner County, Kans., praying for repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MALONEY presented letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Ridgewood Non-Partisan Club and the Hopeville School faculty, of Waterbury; the executive board of the Holy Name Society of St. John's Church, of Watertown; the Boy Scout Troop Committee of St. John's Church, of Bridgeport; the Holy Name Society of Mount Carmel Church, of Meriden; several citizens of Manchester; Rev. Benedict Biro, pastor of St. Emery's Church, of Fairfield; sundry citizens of Ukrainian descent, of Stamford; and sundry citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for adherence to the existing neutrality law and the continuation of the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend General Welfare Act, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hagerstown and Frederick, Md., praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Brute' Council, No. 1860, Knights of Columbus, of Emmitsburg; members of the Cadoa Residence Club, of Baltimore; a group of Catholic women voters of St. Martin's Guild, of Gaithersburg and Rockville; members of St. James Catholic Church, of Baltimore; and sundry citizens, all in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against lifting the embargo on the shipment of arms to Spain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY presented a petition of sundry citizens of San Marcos and vicinity, in the State of Texas, praying for the repeal of existing neutrality legislation and the enactment of a new neutrality law distinguishing in international policy between aggressors and their victims, and denying the help of our economic resources to the former and granting it to the latter under conditions designed to remove the risk of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Rev. Martin Fischer, O. S. B., chaplain, and members of the congregation of St. Mary's Church, of Windthorst; and Rev. Robert P. Schertz and sundry citizens of Westphalia, all in the State of Texas, praying for retention of the principle of the present neutrality law and extension of the law to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Houston and the Bishop of Galveston, C. E. Byrne, transmitting the names of nearly 400 citizens signing a petition at a Holy Name rally, praying for adherence to the existing neutrality law and continuation of the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Crystal City, Tex., praying that the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain be not lifted, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WAGNER presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from Mayor Frank J. Hogan, of Troy, and Alex Rose, State secretary of the American Labor Party, of New York City, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation making an appropriation of \$875,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration, as recommended by the President, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Central Trades and Labor Council of New York City, praying for an appropriation of \$1,050,000,000 to maintain the present number of workers under the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. CARAWAY presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

Whereas glaring inequalities characterize education opportunities and expenditures for schools throughout the Nation; and
Whereas the level of educational service that can be maintained under present circumstances in Arkansas and other States is below the minimum necessary for the preservation of democratic institutions; and

Whereas the citizenship of Arkansas rightfully demand that the youth of this State be permitted to enjoy adequate educational

advantages in keeping with the youth of other States in the Union, which advantages cannot be provided without the assistance of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Arkansas assembled in regular session (the house of representatives concurring therein), That this representative group of Arkansas citizenship hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide Federal grants for educational purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in Washington, D. C., and to each member of Arkansas' congressional delegation.

Mrs. CARAWAY also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the President of the United States, on Thursday, January 12, in a special message, has urged upon Congress the immediate appropriation of necessary funds for the national defense, in order that the country may not be unprepared for defense against aggressor nations; and

Whereas an adequate national-defense program has been advocated for 20 years by the American Legion, other patriotic organizations, and citizens, many of whom by their service and experience know the cost to an unprepared nation; and

Whereas the critical international conditions prove the wisdom and necessity of an expanded national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Arkansas assembled in regular session (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Arkansas delegation in the Congress be memorialized to support wholeheartedly the President's program of defense; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately dispatched to said Senators and Congressmen.

Mrs. CARAWAY also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation permitting the use of Federal funds for improvement and maintenance of county roads used as rural mail routes

Whereas the use of Federal funds for road work appears now to be limited to the construction of new roads and is not available for improving or maintaining county roads already in existence over which United States mails are carried; and

Whereas in many of the counties of Arkansas there are hundreds of miles of county roads already in use but in bad condition and in great need of improvement and maintenance in order to facilitate the carrying of the United States mails over them and public travel generally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Arkansas (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is memorialized and requested to enact proper legislation to permit the use of an adequate amount of Federal road funds in the improvement and maintenance of county public roads over which United States mails are now carried or may hereafter be carried.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a telegram received by me from the Governor of the State of New York, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, appealing to the Senate not to reduce the Federal relief appropriation.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y., January 13, 1939.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,

United States Senate:

Any reduction in Federal relief appropriations which would require the dropping of needy unemployed persons from the Works Progress Administration rolls more rapidly than they can be absorbed by industry would, in my opinion, inevitably impose on the State of New York and its municipalities an additional burden which they could not possibly carry.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Governor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Connecticut, urging that the Congress do not decrease the funds proposed to be appropriated for relief purposes. In this connection I also present and ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD

and appropriately referred telegrams which I have received from Hon. John W. Murphy, mayor of New Haven, Conn., the largest city in my State, relating to the same subject.

There being no objection, the resolution and telegrams were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the senate, That President Roosevelt's proposal to the United States Congress recommending a W. P. A. deficiency appropriation in the amount of \$875,000,000 be, and the same is hereby, wholeheartedly indorsed by the Senate of the General Assembly of Connecticut, and that the clerk of the senate be instructed to inform the Connecticut delegation to Congress of such action and urge them to vote for said appropriation.

Passed January 12, 1939.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., January 12, 1939.

United States Senator FRANK MALONEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly urge you support present proposal of eight hundred and seventy-five million for W. P. A. New Haven has no money on hand or in 1939 budget to meet increased relief costs that committee proposal of seven hundred and twenty-five millions will compel if adopted.

JOHN W. MURPHY,
Mayor of New Haven.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., January 19, 1939.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY:

I again respectfully urge your support of eight hundred and seventy-five millions W. P. A. appropriation. Reduction to seven hundred and twenty-five millions will put many now on W. P. A. back on direct relief and thus add to tax burden of real-estate owners, many of whom are poor people.

JOHN W. MURPHY,
Mayor, New Haven, Conn.

FLOOD CONTROL IN THE STATES

Mr. MALONEY. I further present and ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred and published in the RECORD as part of my remarks a telegram which I have received from the several Governors of the New England States and another separate telegram from the Governor of Vermont, Hon. George D. Aiken, relating to flood control, and a copy of my reply thereto.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON MASS., January 14, 1939.

Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY:

We urge the Federal Government to cooperate immediately with the New England States to accomplish flood control without demanding the complete surrender to the Federal Government of basic rights which belong to the people in the States.

We believe that the natural resources of all the States belong to the people therein and that they should not be taken away without the consent of the States, acting through the duly chosen representatives of the people.

Gov. GEORGE D. AIKEN, *Montpelier, Vt.*
Gov. FRANCIS P. MURPHY, *Concord, N. H.*
Gov. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, *Hartford, Conn.*
Gov. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, *Boston, Mass.*
Gov. LEWIS O. BARROWS, *Augusta, Maine.*
Gov. WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT, *Providence, R. I.*

MONTPELIER, VT., January 14, 1939.

Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Washington, D. C.:

I have been informed that the President has stated that if Vermont doesn't want any dams Vermont doesn't have to have them. I hope the President is not trying to becloud the real issue. It is not flood-control dams we oppose. It is surrendering of State sovereignty and resources to the Federal Government as a price for building these dams that we object to. As evidence of this, I am urging the New England congressional delegation to press for ratification of the New England flood-control compacts immediately and to amend the 1938 flood-control law by restoring to all the States the same rights they held previous to its enactment.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Governor of Vermont.

JANUARY 17, 1939.

His Excellency GEORGE D. AIKEN,
The Governor, Montpelier, Vt.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR AIKEN: Please let me acknowledge receipt of your telegram of January 14 referring to the recent statement accredited to President Roosevelt concerning dams in Vermont. I do not believe that the President is trying to becloud the issue, but am firmly of the opinion that he is very much concerned with the building of flood-control dams in New England, and I am confident that so long as there is evidence of cooperation on our part,

we may expect the cooperation of President Roosevelt and his administration.

A part of your telegram advises me that you are urging the New England congressional delegation to press for ratification of the New England flood-control compact immediately and "to amend the 1938 flood-control law by restoring to all the States the same rights they held previous to its enactment."

While I joined in submitting the original flood-control compact, and regret that it failed to receive consideration, I want to look at the matter realistically, and with the desire of bringing about flood control at the earliest possible moment.

It is my opinion that there is not the slightest possibility of getting approval of the compact at this time, and I entertain no hope of the approval of that kind of compact in the future. That being so, it seems to me that a probably futile effort should be abandoned, with the thought in mind that flood control is of paramount importance, and should be attained under the best possible circumstances.

I am as anxious as you are that States' rights be preserved and protected, but I am not blind to the fact that changing conditions and a changing public desire, necessarily bring about a change in governmental policy and practice. We cannot neglect the protection of the lives and health and property of the people of New England or ignore a course that has been determined by the Congress and will probably endure.

When I lent my efforts toward the approval of the original compact, I did so upon the understanding that the primary concern of the authors and sponsors of the pact was to provide adequate protection of the people of New England against floods. In the last session of Congress it seemed to me that the differences arose through an honest disagreement as to the best method of achieving this objective.

I regret that I am forced to conclude that the seemingly irreconcilable attitude reflected in your recent statements indicates that this primary objective seems in danger of being abandoned. It will be most unfortunate if action on this important public question should be impeded by considerations of private power problems. You know full well my attitude in this respect. I have never sponsored and never will sponsor the preservation of private control of national resources as a social objective.

At this time, deeply conscious that the emergency with respect to floods requires an immediate understanding between the States of New England and the National Government, I feel I would be unresponsive to the pressing needs of the people of my State if I joined with you in an uncompromising stand. I do not recognize that any academic adherence to the rights of individual States, as against the extension of a national program, should be insisted upon where danger to the lives, health, and property of individual citizens may be involved.

In my opinion the time has come for action, and it seems clear that the National Government must take the lead. I am confident that the real interests of the citizens of New England can best be served by working out a program for such action, and I shall support any reasonable plan. In any case, you may be certain that I shall not sacrifice protection against floods for a preservation of private control over power sites.

I am sure that you will continue your approach to a solution of the matter in a spirit of compromise. I still feel that the difficulties can be overcome without sacrifice on the part of the people of Vermont or the other New England States, and I suggest that the Governors of New England, all of whom have wired to me, seek a conference with the authorities here in a further effort to bring about a satisfactory agreement.

May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that funds now available might not be available a little later. Unless we do come to an agreement and get flood-control work under way before the close of this fiscal year, we may sacrifice an existing opportunity and at the same time subject the people of our States to further flood dangers.

My State is in greater danger from floods than the State of which you are chief executive, and I am sure that you believe that I am tremendously concerned with the subject which is now having your attention.

If you think well of my suggestion that an effort be made to arrange a conference with the Washington authorities, please feel certain of my cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate.

REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 326) for the payment of awards and appraisals heretofore made in favor of citizens of the United States on claims presented under the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, United States and Mexico, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 3) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am advised that a number of Senators desire to introduce bills and resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that they may be permitted to do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PITTMAN:

S. 799. A bill to extend the facilities of the Public Health Service to active officers of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 800. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, issue silver certificates, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, 9 p. m., known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon Irrigation District under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 802. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in restoring and developing the potential productivity of natural grasslands and other ranges in the States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 803. A bill to grant permission for the interment of the ashes of the late Louis C. Hill at Roosevelt Dam, Ariz.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 804. A bill for the relief of John W. Barbrick; and
S. 805. A bill for the relief of George S. Geer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 806. A bill granting a pension to Lucy A. Thayer; and
S. 807. A bill granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Armington; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Calliope Minaca Pilavakis; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 809. A bill for the relief of Jessie M. Durst; and
S. 810. A bill for the relief of Joe Pizl, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

S. 811. A bill for the relief of George A. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 812. A bill for the relief of Linza Wesley Bowers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 813. A bill granting an increase of pension to William C. Milliner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUNDEEN:

S. 814. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of three transcontinental and six north-south highways; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 815. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 816. A bill to place the name of Jeannette Earle Morser on the final roll of the Cherokee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 817. A bill granting a pension to Lee A. Smith; and

S. 818. A bill granting an increase of pension to Caroline Rhude; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of James Patrick Mahar; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 820. A bill providing for the granting of leave to certain employees of the United States to enable them to vote at elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Kee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 822. A bill for the relief of the heirs at law of Barnabas W. Baker and Joseph Baker;

S. 823. A bill for the relief of John P. Shorter; and

S. 824. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach, and others, for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 825. A bill for the relief of Hugh Frederick Barnhart; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 826. A bill granting an increase in pension to Decatur M. Bronson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 827. A bill for the relief of John H. Barry; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bills 828, 829, and 830, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 831. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to authorize the Commodity Exchange Commission to regulate customer margin requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 832. A bill granting a pension to Rose Mary Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 833. A bill to further reduce for 2 additional years the interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, and on land bank commissioner's loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 834. A bill for the relief of Bert Peters; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 835. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees of contractors on public buildings and public works; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 836. A bill for the relief of Russel E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 837. A bill to admit Mrs. Henry Francis Parks permanently to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 838. A bill for the relief of Thomas L. Boren; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 839. A bill to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904;

S. 840. A bill to amend and clarify the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1507), and for other purposes;

S. 841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to prescribe the number of grades and ratings of enlisted men of the Army;

S. 842. A bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the number of aircraft authorized to be procured and maintained; and

S. 843. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 844. A bill to simplify the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WAGNER, Mr. VAN NUYS, and Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 845, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUNDEEN:

S. 846. A bill making an appropriation for seed flax investigations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 847. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial board conviction of Amos B. Cole and his resulting dismissal, and to reinstate Amos B. Cole to his former position as member of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 848. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 849. A bill forbidding the payment of ransom or reward in kidnapping cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Maj. Wilbur Rogers; and

S. 851. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide appropriate military honors at the funerals of certain veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 852. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Chaplains' Corps; and

S. 853. A bill to constitute the Chaplains' Corps with a general officer as chief; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing appropriation for expenses of a representative of the United States and of his assistants, and for one-half of the joint expenses of this Government and the Government of Mexico in giving effect to the agreement of November 9-12, 1938, between the two Governments providing for the settlement of American claims for damages resulting from expropriations of agrarian properties since August 30, 1927; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the coinage of 1-cent pieces to symbolize peace; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—NAVAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I introduce several bills for appropriate reference. Three of the bills are introduced at the request of the Navy Department and relate to the administration policy for the national defense. I ask that a brief memorandum explanatory of the naval bills be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and the memorandum of the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

S. 828. A bill to permit the President to acquire and convert, as well as to construct, certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy;

S. 829. A bill to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. 830. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The explanatory memorandum presented by Mr. WALSH is as follows:

MEMORANDUM EXPLANATORY OF NAVAL BILLS

1. A bill to authorize the President to acquire and convert, as well as construct, certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy. The last Congress authorized the construction of a considerable number of auxiliary vessels for the Navy, which consisted of oil tankers, destroyer tenders, aviation tenders, seaplane tenders, mine sweepers, submarine tenders, and fleet tugs.

This bill will permit the President to purchase vessels and convert them into auxiliary vessels for the Navy, as well as to construct new vessels when proper appropriations are made. It does not authorize any additional vessels for the Navy. It is represented that \$1,500,000 can be saved by purchasing for the Navy an oil tanker already under construction by the Maritime Commission for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The enactment of this bill will enable the Navy to obtain an additional high-speed tanker in the shortest possible time.

2. A bill authorizing modernization of three submarines—the *Argonaut*, *Narwhal*, and *Nautilus*—at an estimated cost of \$5,500,000. The military value of these vessels has been seriously reduced by defects in their main propelling plants. These vessels are powered with German type Diesel engines built at the Navy Yard, New York. They are defective in speed and severe crankcase explosions have occurred on all three vessels, a casualty seemingly inherent in the design and which resulted in the loss by fire of the *Fulton*.

Senator WALSH stated that the Navy Department is of the opinion that the reengining and modernization of these vessels will greatly increase their value to the Navy by enabling them to maintain speeds necessary for operations with the fleet. These vessels have

excellent sea-keeping qualities, carry a large number of mines and torpedoes, and have a long radius of action.

3. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop or increase naval aviation facilities, including authority to purchase or otherwise acquire land and to construct buildings and accessories at or in the vicinity of the following places: Kaneohe Bay; Midway Island; Wake Island; Johnston Island; Palmyra Island; Kodiak, Alaska; Sitka, Alaska; San Juan, P. R.; Pensacola, Fla.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Pearl Harbor, T. H.; and Guam.

These air bases constitute a selected number from the so-called Hepburn board report to the Congress on the needs and location of air, submarine destroyer, and mine bases. The total estimated cost is \$65,000,000. The Hepburn Board recommended the acquisition of or major improvements to 41 naval bases, and this bill, as submitted by the Navy, falls far short of the recommendations contained in the Hepburn report.

PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and myself I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and ask that an explanatory joint statement of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 845) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint statement of Mr. WAGNER, Mr. VAN NUYS, and Mr. CAPPER is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATORS WAGNER, VAN NUYS, AND CAPPER UPON INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL ANTILYNCHING BILL

The year 1938 witnessed a repetition of a familiar pattern in the tragic history of lynching in the United States. During the first 6 months, when the Wagner-Van Nuys-Gavagan antilynching bill was pending in Congress and was being vigorously pressed, not a single lynching stained the record. During the second half of the year, and beginning promptly after the adjournment of Congress, seven lynchings occurred in rapid succession. Although more than 1,000 persons participated in the lynching mobs, there has not been a single conviction, prosecution, or even an arrest. If the threat of a Federal antilynching bill is sufficient to put a temporary halt to lynching, that is the very best argument for a permanent Federal antilynching law.

The introduction of the antilynching bill at this time is the opening gun in the renewal of the fight to write such legislation into the statute books. The fight must go on until carried to a successful conclusion. We cannot stop until lynching stops.

The bill we have just introduced follows closely the pattern of the Wagner-Van Nuys-Gavagan bill which was pending in the last Congress. State officers, guilty of neglecting or refusing to use all diligence in the protection of persons from lynching mobs, are subject to criminal prosecution. In addition, the governmental subdivisions in which such lynchings occur are subject to civil suits for damages in the Federal courts. Whenever a lynching occurs and information of violation of this law is submitted under oath to the Attorney General, the Attorney General of the United States is required to institute an investigation.

The bill differs from that considered in the last Congress in two respects. First, it eliminates the exception of "gangster killings" from the definition of lynching. This exemption was not included in the bill as originally introduced, and its sponsors were pledged during the last Congress to strike out this exemption when the bill reached a vote on the Senate floor.

The second point of difference involves the issue of proof of liability in civil suits for damages. The bill last year imposed upon the county the burden of proving that its officers had exercised all due diligence to prevent the lynching in question. The new bill eliminates this provision, so that the burden of proving negligence is at all times on the party bringing suit. The bill declares, however, that a showing of failure to provide protection under certain circumstances, such as after knowledge or general apprehension of danger of mob violence, shall be prima facie evidence of liability.

In recent months the course of world affairs has focused the attention of our people as never before on the fundamentals of democratic government. The antilynching bill goes beyond any considerations of party; it transcends the urgent needs of any one race or any one section. The bill embraces those principles of humanity and justice which underlie the establishment of representative government among free men. If America is to vindicate its proud position as the foremost example of a functioning democracy, it must stamp out for all time the spirit of the lawless mob. It can and will be done.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. SHEPPARD, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill

(S. 473) for the relief of George Francis Burke, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

On motion by Mr. MINTON, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 556) for the relief of Catherine Humler, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Power Commission reported on January 3, 1934, that the tidal power project at Passamaquoddy was unsound and unjustified; (1) because it will cost approximately \$40,000,000 while a comparable steam-generating plant would cost only \$16,000,000; (2) because the steam-electric power would be cheaper at the higher-load factors; (3) because Quoddy power could not compete with steam-power rates in export; (4) and because there is no present or prospective market for Quoddy power at any price; and

Whereas the Congress has been asked to resume its consideration of the Passamaquoddy project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Power Commission is requested to review its previous reports upon this project and bring them down to date; and to report to the Senate as soon as possible (1) the relative costs of steam-generated or tidal-generated power plants at Passamaquoddy; (2) the relative costs of power to the consumer; and (3) whether there is either a local or export market for power thus generated by either method.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire whether legislation on this subject heretofore has come from the Commerce Committee or the Interstate Commerce Committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised by the clerk that it has been before the Commerce Committee.

Is there objection to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Commerce? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be so referred.

FLORIDA SHIP CANAL

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit another resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Department of the Interior reported on August 26, 1935, the opinion of the United States Geological Survey that "there appears to be no reasonable doubt that serious adverse effects will be produced upon the important underground water supplies of the Ocala limestone in a wide zone extending outward from the canal line by the construction of a sea-level (Florida) canal"; and

Whereas the United States Geological Survey asserted on December 15, 1936, that it "knows no facts that require modification of the opinions it has heretofore expressed about the possible effects on ground-water levels in Florida" of the construction of such a canal; and

Whereas this phase of the Florida ship canal problem is of deep concern to many citizens, and of primary interest to the Congress in connection with any further study of this project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to report to the Senate at his earliest convenience the present opinion of the United States Geological Survey regarding the probable effect of the construction of the Florida canal, as reprojected, upon ground-water levels and ground-water supplies in any affected area.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not catch one expression, about whose opinion is asked for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The opinion of the United States Geological Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit one further resolution which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Commerce made an exhaustive and voluminous report upon the proposed Florida ship canal in 1934 and found that "the consensus of opinion of that part of the shipping industry with which contact has been established appears to be that the probable cost of building the projected waterway is not justified through any benefits which might thereby accrue to the cargo or the vessel"; and

Whereas the Congress is again asked to consider this project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Commerce is requested to survey its previous findings respecting the Florida ship canal and bring them down to date and to report thereon to the Senate at its earliest convenience.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators in the United States Senate. Florida has availed itself of that provision of the Constitution, and has sent to this body two Senators who are endeavoring to represent the people of Florida in respect to their local affairs. So I am somewhat chagrined to have my friend the Senator from Michigan take upon his competent shoulders the representation of the people of Florida about their local water supply, along with the people of Michigan.

Grateful as we are for the contribution the Senator makes to things which affect the general public weal, we are getting along fairly well in Florida. My colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] and I are for the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal, and we have been elected in the State of Florida. So, on matters pertaining to the internal welfare of that State, we shall appreciate it if we may be given an opportunity to protect the interests of our citizenry to the best of our ability.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire fully to acknowledge the great capacity of Florida's representation in the Senate, and to disclaim any purpose to supersede it by way of spokesman for Florida; but inasmuch as the State of Florida is asking for upward of \$200,000,000 in connection with this project, for which my State of Michigan has to pay at least to the tune of \$10,000,000, I shall continue to exercise at least \$10,000,000 worth of interest in what Florida is undertaking to do. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know of no Senator more capable of asserting at least \$10,000,000 worth of interest in this matter than the Senator from Michigan, because it has had a particular appeal to the interest of the Senator from Michigan ever since it has been before the Congress.

I know not what it is about Florida that has such great attraction for my friend the Senator from Michigan, but I know at least that he placed a degree of emphasis on the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal which is at least very flattering to the ego of Florida. So I will not question the Senator's right to interest himself in the expenditure of Federal money, and I did not address my remarks to that portion of the Senator's comment. But it is not the first time that our friend from Michigan has interested himself in the effect which the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal would have on the water supply of Florida. I was a candidate for election in Florida in May and November of last year, and I stated publicly and unequivocally my support of the Florida ship canal. So it is only the interest of the Senator in our internal water supply, unless his geological knowledge is greater than I think it is, to which I object.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Gladly.

Mr. BURKE. Does the Senator from Florida raise any objection to the propriety of asking at this time that the

various departments of government which heretofore have declared that the Florida ship canal was neither feasible nor proper should bring their reports down to date? That was all that was embodied in the request of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PEPPER. I will answer the query of the Senator from Nebraska in this way: I recall that when this project was before the Congress the last time, at least before this body, it came here in a manner somewhat out of the ordinary for a river and harbor project. But I know that that unusual procedure has long since been departed from in respect to this project, and that in the last Congress, pursuant to a resolution passed in 1932, there was filed through the agency of the Secretary of War, from the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a favorable recommendation of the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal.

Based upon that report, which was identical, so far as procedure was concerned, with the report which accompanies every other river and harbor project, the regular committee of the House of Representatives, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, undertook an open and public hearing, as the result of which not an irregular body, but the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, favorably reported to the House of Representatives the bill providing for the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal.

Mr. President, everything, therefore, is in order in the consideration of that matter, the same as when any other river and harbor project is considered. I shall ask only that this project in the future receive the usual and the regular and the proper consideration which any other river and harbor project would receive from the engineers and from the Congress of the United States, and only that.

The Committee on Commerce of the Senate now has the President's recommendation before it. I ask only such privileges, and willingly accept such liability, for this project as will attach to the usual river and harbor project which comes before Congress.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, the Senator has not answered my question, as to whether he was opposed to asking the Department of Commerce, in the first instance—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is transacting routine business by unanimous consent, and the order now is the presentation of resolutions.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-sixth Con-

gress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY BEFORE WASHINGTON POST OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Washington Post of the Jewish War Veterans in Washington, D. C., January 17, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER TO YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF SEATTLE, WASH.

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator PEPPER at the national rally of Young Democratic Clubs at Seattle, Wash., July 16, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

WATERWAYS AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him for delivery at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association on the 21st of November 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURE IN THE SOUTH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Donald Comer, president of the Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala., before the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation on December 12, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY DINNER—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES W. MORRIS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James W. Morris, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in Portland, Maine, on January 7, 1939, on the subject Effective Democratic Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE COMMISSIONS AND FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER WALKER

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Paul A. Walker, Federal Communications Commissioner, at the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, New Orleans, La., on November 16, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF THE SILVER PROGRAM

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from letters received by him with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 1, providing for the appointment of a special joint committee to investigate the silver program, which appear in the Appendix.]

FLORIDA SHIP CANAL

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Herald on January 18, 1939, on the subject Florida Ship Canal, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the following nominations:

Forrest F. Hill, of New York, to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William I. Myers, resigned;

Edward C. Eicher, of Iowa, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1940, the office to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John W. Hanes, resigned; and

Franklin W. Hancock, Jr., of North Carolina, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 6 years from July 22, 1938, the office to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William F. Stevenson, term expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, reported favorably the nomination of Henry Ohl, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education to fill an unexpired term of 3 years ending July 16, 1941.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for promotion or appointment in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION OF HARRY L. HOPKINS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I desire to state that by direction of the Committee on Commerce, and under authority of the order of the Senate of the 17th instant, I filed on yesterday with the Secretary of the Senate a favorable report on the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination reported by the Senator from Texas.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry L. Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in taking up the nomination of the Honorable Harry L. Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce, I desire to say in the beginning that I accord to any President of the United States, regardless of party, the maximum latitude in choosing his own advisers, in other words, his Cabinet, and I accord to the present President of the United States that degree of latitude. At the outset I wish to say that I shall discuss Mr. Hopkins as a nominee for a Cabinet office, and not as an individual. I think the policies of Mr. Hopkins as Administrator of the Works Progress Administration are proper matters for consideration by this body.

Mr. Hopkins has been a conspicuous member of this administration for several years. As head of the Works Progress Administration he has been at the head of the largest spending agency this Government has ever had in times of peace, and, so far as my reading of history goes, the largest spending agency ever known in peacetimes in any nation.

For the last 2 or 3 years there have been increasing complaints about and criticism of the W. P. A. and its administration. Those complaints became so numerous, and were apparently so well founded, that the Senate of the Seventy-fifth Congress authorized a committee to investigate, among other things, rumors and reports about the W. P. A. That committee was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], whose integrity, earnestness, and fairness have never been and I do not think ever could be

questioned. I may say the same for his colleagues on the committee, three of whom were Democrats, from the other side, and one a Republican, from this side.

In discussing this matter this afternoon I shall not rely upon rumor, I shall repeat no gossip, I shall indulge in no personal questions. I shall call as witnesses only those distinguished Senators who were members of the committee to which I have referred, and who fairly and industriously and earnestly investigated the reports which I have mentioned.

At the beginning of its work the committee, known as the Sheppard committee, made two statements, which I desire to read to the Senate. They are very clear statements of a sound public policy, a policy so important that I think it goes to the very foundation of the Republic. I read now the statement of the committee to be found on page 3 of part 1 of its report. The committee stated its objective in this language:

The objective is simple and clear—the maintenance of the integrity of the elective processes, the preservation of democracy at its most vital point, the ballot box, the free exercise of the voting franchise, and to that end the prevention of any improper use of money and of any coercion or intimidation by any person, group, or agency, outside or inside the Government.

The statement I am now going to read was made by the committee on the 17th of June of last year. It further said:

The committee likewise gives warning that all governmental agencies must keep clear of all primary and election campaigns—must keep their hands off. Any other course, in the judgment of the committee, would amount in reality to the use of Federal funds to influence votes, and under the terms of the Senate resolutions would require investigation and censure, and is to be exposed, condemned, and prevented insofar as it is within the power of this committee to do so.

In connection with those two statements, in which I concur and with which I most heartily agree, the committee defined those things which it would regard as offenses against the law. Beginning on page 3 and continuing on to page 4 of the report of the committee is found this language:

Solicitation or assessment of Federal officials and employees either by Federal officials and employees or others for contributions in behalf of a senatorial candidate; * * * intimidation or coercion by Federal officials and employees or others in behalf of a senatorial candidate; use of funds appropriated by Congress in behalf of a senatorial candidate.

These declarations were made by the committee at so early a date that they preceded virtually every primary election in the States which had to choose Senators last year, and so Mr. Hopkins and every member of the personnel of the W. P. A., down to the humblest worker, were charged by the committee with notice of its conception of a sound public policy and of the things which it regarded as contrary to the public interest, and therefore unlawful.

The committee went to work. It industriously investigated the situation. In discussing the matter I feel that I should take only the amount of time sufficient to discuss the report of the committee as it pertains to three States, and that I shall do. I do not want my limitation to those three States to be taken as a confession on my part that there was no abuse of the use of W. P. A. funds, no oppression of W. P. A. workers, no coercion of the poor, or no misuse of the money appropriated for the relief of misery and distress in any other State.

I shall take up first, following the report of the committee, the State of Kentucky. I read now from the report of the committee, to be found on page 11. Following is the language of the committee:

During June of 1938 a series of articles dealing extensively with conditions in the Kentucky primary by one of the staff writers for a prominent press association was published, in which he alleged * * * undue political activities in the W. P. A. in Kentucky. A press release containing a résumé of all charges contained in these articles, 22 charges in all, prepared in the form of individual paragraphs, and a reply to each, by Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, was issued by the W. P. A. at Washington, D. C., on June 30, 1938. Mr. Hopkins denied all but two of these charges, admitting the correctness of these two.

I still read from the committee's report:

The committee's representative, and the force assisting him, after investigation, made a report sustaining the staff writer in a majority of the charges and concurring with Mr. Hopkins in four instances.

The findings of the committee's investigator in reference to these charges indicated solicitation of W. P. A. employees and officials for contributions to the campaign funds * * * and a systematic canvassing of W. P. A. employees as to preference in the race for the Democratic senatorial nomination. These activities, so far as solicitations were concerned, were carried on mainly by private parties, not connected with W. P. A., but in some instances by W. P. A. officials. Canvassing activities were carried on by W. P. A. officials entirely.

The situation in the Kentucky campaign is a matter of common knowledge. Nothing that I say here departs from the view which the committee took, that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader of the Senate, was in no way a party to what happened, but in the public interest I think it is important that there be put into the RECORD the report of the committee, insofar as it may be done, upon these matters.

I now read a further statement of the Sheppard committee, beginning on page 12 of part 1 of its report:

In Pulaski and Russell Counties, which are both located in the second district of the W. P. A. for the State of Kentucky, there was a systematic canvass of all certified workers instituted, whereby lists of all the workers were copied from the official records on forms with columns headed: "Name and address," "Identification No.," "Mark," "Number in family," and "Remarks."

The committee further said:

These forms were mimeographed for the most part on the back of stationery on which is printed "Works Progress Administration in Kentucky."

It further said:

That it was admitted in an affidavit by S. C. Taylor, area engineer of the W. P. A. for Pulaski and Russell Counties, that the said canvass was instituted by his personal direction and that copies thereof were handed to all foremen to have them filled out, to get the political affiliation of the workers; that the foremen were instructed to put in the column designated "Mark" whether the worker was a Republican or a Democrat.

The committee further said:

That he, said Taylor, had had a list of all voters in Pulaski and Russell Counties copied from the county records, in order to check them with the said lists.

Then the committee says on the same page:

Despite contrary protestations, the investigation discloses that in many instances men known to hold views contrary were discharged, there being always assigned some reason other than political, and that being denied.

The committee deals with the Kentucky primary situation at some length.

I shall read one further extract from its report, beginning at the bottom of page 12, and continuing over to page 13, as follows:

That in the first W. P. A. district, which comprises the 32 western-most counties in Kentucky, there was a recognized comprehensive canvass of the entire personnel of the W. P. A. in those counties, comprising approximately 18,000 employees, of whom approximately 17,200 were certified workers.

I again read from the committee's report:

That the efforts of the entire supervisory force were coordinated in a plan to place in the hands of the campaign committee chairmen for each of the 32 counties a list of the names and addresses of the 17,200 workers, which list also showed the names and addresses of all legal voters in the respective families, whether or not they were registered, whether or not they had moved since registering, and precinct where registered.

Further, the committee said:

That forms to provide for this information to be filled out by the 340 project timekeepers of said district No. 1 for the workers were mimeographed in the W. P. A. office at Madisonville, Ky., headquarters for the W. P. A. district No. 1, on official time, at Government expense, except for stationery, which was furnished by the campaign committee.

Again:

That the 9 supervising timekeepers in charge of the 340 project timekeepers for said district No. 1 received their instructions to carry out this plan from their immediate superior, the supervisor of tools and equipment for W. P. A. district No. 1, who in turn received his instructions from the director, J. B. Boddie, of W. P. A. district No. 1.

The committee further said:

It is true that Mr. Hopkins, after an investigation of his own, disagreed with some of the findings of the committee as stated

above. The committee, however, after still further investigation of its own, adhered to its own findings.

Mr. President, I think that is all that needs to be said about the Kentucky situation. I now move to the sovereign State of Tennessee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator leaves Kentucky, has he the information available to complete his recital, showing what action, if any, was taken when these matters were called to Mr. Hopkins' attention?

Mr. REED. I am sorry to have to say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I have not had time to make that investigation. I think it would be of very great interest, and I hope the Sheppard investigating committee may pursue its investigation further.

Mr. President, I am a freshman Senator, and feel timid in the presence of the great Senators sitting in this Chamber. However, I shall be very happy to introduce a resolution to that effect unless one of the senior Senators should see fit to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not think I made clear what I was attempting to suggest to the Senator. The Senator has recited conditions that existed in Kentucky. As the record from which he read now stands, there is nothing in the recital to show whether or not Mr. Hopkins did anything about it, and, if he did anything about it, what he did. Mr. Hopkins might claim that he did not know about these things.

Mr. REED. I am coming to that.

Let us go over into Tennessee. The story in Tennessee is not a long story, but it is a fairly horrible story of the misuse of public funds and the coercion of men and women on the W. P. A. rolls.

I now read from the report of the committee, part I, page 18:

The report of our investigators in Tennessee shows that there was a vigorous effort throughout the State to raise campaign funds by contributions from Federal employees, including not only those having civil-service status but those having relief classifications as well, with circumstances in certain instances indicating intimidation and coercion, or efforts partaking of intimidation and coercion.

That such employees included not only certified and nonrelief workers of W. P. A. but certain employees of other Federal agencies.

The committee further says, on page 19:

That contributions from Federal employees for the coalition ticket were solicited by attorneys and other persons and from W. P. A. noncertified workers by foremen, timekeepers, and others, with the knowledge of ranking W. P. A. officials.

I now invite attention to the following language, which is the language of the committee:

That Works Progress Administration labor and materials, paid for with funds appropriated by the Congress for emergency relief purposes, namely, farm-to-market roads, have been used in the construction, improvement, and repair of private drives and roadways under circumstances and conditions giving rise to a fair inference that such use may have been suffered and permitted for the purpose of influencing votes and voting in behalf of both sides.

Finally, so far as Tennessee is concerned, I conclude with the following, from page 20 of the committee's report:

The committee has evidence of similar solicitation by W. P. A. workers and private parties in different parts of the State.

I now move from the State of Tennessee to the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Of course, I come from the kind of a State which the Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee has described as a "typical prairie State." Therefore, I freely grant that I am not qualified to speak upon the brand and character of politics played in Pennsylvania. However, I shall read what the very able committee had to say, in part, as to the conditions in various counties in Pennsylvania, from which probably a greater stench arose than from any other section of the United States.

On page 23 the committee said:

The committee heard evidence from its investigators that owners of trucks used on W. P. A. projects were solicited for \$100 each in Carbon County, Pa., that owners of trucks were requested by

W. P. A. officials to visit the representative of a certain political leader at his home, that on one occasion 10 or 12 were at the home of this political leader at one time, and the committee has been furnished with affidavits that 7 were solicited there, that 4 promised contributions to the campaign and afterward made part or full payments on these contributions.

The committee further stated:

The investigators of the committee reported further that in Luzerne County large numbers of W. P. A. workers were mailed postal cards requesting them to call at Democratic headquarters on particular dates at different hours. The investigators reported that there was some evidence that lists had been prepared of relief workers at the W. P. A. headquarters in their county, and it is believed that these lists were used in mailing out the postal cards. Further evidence from the investigators showed that when these relief workers called at the Democratic headquarters they were solicited for campaign contributions, in some cases the amounts requested being \$100.

This phase of the report continues on page 24, from which I read:

The investigators further stated that they had affidavits that at these visits by relief workers contributions were actually made. The investigators of the committee further reported that the Democratic leader who was interviewing these relief workers and to whose office they were sent, was employed by the Unemployment Compensation Service, which aids in administering the social security law and whose salary is paid, in part at least, from funds coming from the Federal Treasury, and was on leave from his official position, working for the Democratic Party.

Those activities are pretty bad, but they are not all. Again I read from the report of the committee, on page 24:

Investigators also reported that in Northampton County they had obtained evidence that in three cases either the forelady or the supervisor of a women's sewing project under the W. P. A. had handled the sale of tickets for three different political gatherings, the tickets being in two instances \$1 apiece, and in another instance \$1.50. The evidence further showed that large numbers of these women on this sewing project purchased tickets. The supervisor of the W. P. A. admitted to the committee that at least 30 tickets were sold for one of these political gatherings, that 125 were sold at another, and that 123 were sold to or at a third political gathering. The investigators also reported that the ticket selling by foremen and forewomen on W. P. A. projects was general in that county.

I continue to read:

The committee's investigation in Pennsylvania showed that in some instances pressure was brought to bear on W. P. A. employees and workers by individuals outside the W. P. A. For instance, under date of October 24, 1938, Mr. Joseph F. McElwee, chairman of the Democratic committee in Montgomery County, Norristown, Pa., mailed a letter addressed to "Fellow Democrats," which stated that at the direction of Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and Mr. David L. Lawrence a joint meeting of all State, Federal, and W. P. A. workers would be held in Norristown on a certain date at a specified time. The letter went on to say:

And the committee places this phrase in quotation marks: There will be no excuse accepted for lack of attendance.

That is the end of the quotation.

I continue to read from the committee's report:

"There will be no excuse accepted for lack of attendance." A representative of the committee attended the meeting mentioned in Mr. McElwee's letter and reported that about 2,500 persons were present. * * *

The committee—

is of the opinion that the phrase "There will be no excuse accepted for lack of attendance," addressed to W. P. A. workers on relief, is indefensible, and that it is in the nature of an implied threat and a grave interference with the right of relief workers to be free from coercion in the exercise of their political rights.

I have not quite finished with Pennsylvania. I read now from page 25 of the committee's report:

In further reference to Luzerne County, the committee found that not only truck owners and truck drivers, but timekeepers, foremen, and other workers and employees were, in numerous instances, solicited for contributions and for the purchase of political tickets; and that such solicitations were not confined alone to persons at Democratic headquarters, but were made by W. P. A. employees. * * *

I continue to read:

This further evidence submitted to the committee by its investigators in Luzerne County showed that numerous W. P. A. workers, including timekeepers, laborers, and others, even women on sewing projects, were requested and ordered to change their registrations from Republican to Democratic with threats of the loss of their relief employments if they refused to comply with the demands;

and it was further disclosed that numerous persons were separated from their employments with W. P. A. shortly after their refusal to accede to such and similar demands.

Now I wish to read the final reference to the disgraceful conditions which were a matter of common knowledge and which have been set down so concisely and so clearly by this most intelligent, earnest, and sincere investigating committee of which the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is the chairman. On page 26 it is stated by the committee:

The investigators further reported to the committee with respect to the Senator DAVIS charges that they had 23 affidavits from persons who testified a demand was made on them to change their registrations from Republican to Democratic, and these persons asserted that in various ways they were threatened with the loss of their jobs if they did not change. "For the most part," the investigators stated, "they were either timekeepers, foremen, or are employed in some supervisory capacity; but, in a few instances, demands were made to change the registration of relief workers and laborers who were receiving \$60.50 a month." The affidavits were uniform in stating that insistent efforts were made to bring about a change of registration and that if they did not change, they would not be able to continue their work on W. P. A.

On page 27 the committee said:

The evidence disclosed, however, that Democratic county officials and Democratic local party workers did bring pressure to bear upon W. P. A. officials in Allegheny and other Pennsylvania counties regarding appointments and dismissals of W. P. A. personnel.

I now read from page 28:

The investigation disclosed that the evidence obtained by the committee's investigators shows conclusively that Hershey picnic tickets were sold to W. P. A. workers and employees, that they were sold in some instances on Government property and W. P. A. projects, and that the transactions in some cases were handled in such a manner as to amount to coercion of the workers into buying the tickets. Evidence was obtained to show in some instances that the full transaction of the sale and the purchase of the tickets was among W. P. A. employees and that there were other forms of political activity on the part of W. P. A. personnel.

And, finally, from the concluding statement of the committee, so far as my quotation goes with regard to Pennsylvania, I wish to quote this most significant paragraph:

Evidence before the committee was to the effect that the average salaries of W. P. A. employees who were solicited was \$60.50 per month. The committee's investigators also reported on the basis of their investigation and observations in Northampton County, Pa., that it was very apparent to them that an atmosphere of fear appeared to exist among all W. P. A. employees in that county, and that if they were to express themselves they would lose their employment.

I have just finished quoting from the report of the committee, with one exception, to which I shall briefly refer later.

Mr. President, I have been in public life a long time; I have seen political parties, my own and the party of the gentlemen upon the other side, do many unlovely things. I have seen them use unsavory methods in the collection and distribution of money in campaigns. They proceeded upon the theory that they were out to win and that "the end justified the means." But, in all my experience and in all my reading of the history of this country, never have I found an instance or instances where political practices were so sordid, where all considerations of fairness and decency were so disregarded as in the cases reported by this committee.

I think we have reached the depth of political depravity when those clothed with authority and power take for political campaign expenses pennies, dimes, and dollars from those nearly destitute, which must be paid out of the meager funds given them through an appropriation by the Congress out of the Treasury of the United States, and that money appropriated not for political purposes but for the relief of misery and suffering.

I do not charge Mr. Hopkins with ordering these things; I do not even charge that he was cognizant of all these things. I do charge, however, that these things could not have taken place except with his general knowledge, and, therefore, with his general consent. Through the administration of Mr. Hopkins there had been built up among W. P. A. workers an atmosphere that emboldened Democratic local workers in the precincts and the counties and in the States to run riot with threats of discharging men and

women from the W. P. A. if they failed to comply with the orders of the Democratic politicians. That happened, if you please, Mr. President, in my own town and in my State, though the committee of the Senate never got to them. I charge these things have produced a condition that represents the lowest level of political management this Nation has ever known.

I do not know whether Mr. Hopkins made the statement which well-known newspaper writers printed as having been made by him, that familiar statement that "we will spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect." I do not think it is important whether or not Mr. Hopkins ever made that statement. The fact remains that that phrase is a cogent statement of the philosophy under which Harry L. Hopkins administered the W. P. A., and was especially apparent in the last 2 years and throughout the last campaign.

In that campaign, as I said, we reached a low level of political morals, in which all considerations of fairness and decency, all sympathy for the poor and distressed, were forgotten.

When Mr. Hopkins was selected for this place, and the announcement was made, it occurred to me as a citizen of the country that the President was taking Mr. Hopkins out of the line of fire which was certain to follow the results of last year's election. In nearly every State where there was a free expression of opinion the so-called New Deal was repudiated. Progressive Republicans, conservative Republicans, Republicans neither conservative nor progressive, but just Republicans, were able to beat New Deal Democrats. I had a part in that campaign. I speak out of first-hand knowledge that one of the important factors in the last campaign was the political mismanagement of the Works Progress Administration.

I desire to read the final and further statement of the committee. You know, in order to get Mr. Hopkins out of the line of fire, he was kicked upstairs. Unfortunately, his principal associate in W. P. A. did not fare so well. I read now from the committee's report on page 32:

Another example of undue political activity was seen in an address by Aubrey Williams, Deputy Works Progress Administrator, before the Save the Professional Works Progress Administration Projects Conference in Washington on June 27, 1938, composed mainly of Works Progress Administration workers. In his address Mr. Williams said in part: "We've got to stick together. We've got to keep our friends in power." The committee felt that this was an unfortunate statement, and made a public announcement to that effect. It believes that where a supervisory official addresses an audience of the employees under him or composed mainly of such employees and urges a certain political line of action he uses a form of coercion contrary to public policy and the spirit of our Government.

Alas, poor Aubrey. While his distinguished superior was being kicked upstairs, he was sent to the cellar.

I have no illusions as to the effect of the remarks I have made, or the emphasis I have placed upon the very able and impartial investigating committee of this body. I have no doubt that when the vote is taken Mr. Hopkins will be confirmed. A majority of the majority upon the other side of the aisle will furnish the votes necessary to do that. I desire, however, to leave with the Senate the thought that when it shall have confirmed the appointment of Harry L. Hopkins it will have condoned the acts, the policies of his administration, and the atmosphere which he created; and we on this side will meet Senators on the other side and their party with that as an issue in the election of 1940.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, my remarks will be very brief, and I ask not to be interrupted while I am speaking.

During my years in the Senate I have never opposed a Cabinet appointment by the President. I dislike to take a contrary position at this time. I know the close relationship which has existed between the President and Mr. Hopkins for many years, reaching back to their work together in New York State. The identity of their interests and the mutual bond of their viewpoints have been thoroughly well established since they have been in Washington together during the past 6 years. I believe that nothing I shall say will prevent the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins. However, I should be recreant in my duty, unrepresentative of my constituents, and false to my own beliefs if I voted to confirm him.

Throughout my entire political experience of over 40 years I have opposed the coercion of the voter. I have fought these pernicious influences within both industry and Government. I shall never yield to this destructive attempt to undermine the American principle of a free electorate.

My experience has taught me that these difficulties are encountered among both Republicans and Democrats, frequently in industry as well as in Government. During the recent campaign in Pennsylvania fear in the hearts of hungry men, open reward by way of a better job, relief fraud, and political coercion caused many to barter away their political liberties and yield to unscrupulous demands of partisanship made upon them.

The private coercion of the voter is intolerable. The public coercion of the voter through public funds is even worse. Words fail to describe the resentment of the American public against these abuses.

I hold in my hand a volume of the Investigation of Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in Pennsylvania, representing undisputed findings of this distinguished Senate committee. It is an honest document. It is a confidential report. This is not the time to review all the instances of public abuses shown in it. I have, however, examined it carefully, and I have entire confidence in the integrity of the Senatorial Campaign Expenditures Committee and its findings in Pennsylvania.

Never before in the history of Pennsylvania has such a brand of infamy been set upon partisan political activity. Never before has there been such open exposure of the naked and unabashed shamelessness of unscrupulous spoilsmen. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures on the perseverance and courage of its labors. I regret that the committee found conditions so unspeakably bad as to make this extended report necessary.

I regret that in the past Pennsylvania has suffered from the tyranny of the political spoilsman. I have been active in my opposition to these practices within my own party. I know full well the nature and the extent of these abuses. But, irrespective of the charges made against Pennsylvania Republicans, history does not record anything which would begin to equal the findings of fraud and voter coercion contained in the volume now before me, the record of the spoilsmen of recent years. Cameron, Quay, Penrose, and Vare were charged with extremes of political partisanship; but their activities pale to insignificance compared to the streamlined plunder of the present day.

I say this as my own party now returns to responsibility in Pennsylvania. I shall expect the same fidelity to public trust in my own party which I ask of any responsible administration. If that trust is violated, I shall openly and promptly condemn it. Under no circumstances will I condone the partisan use of public funds.

Mr. President, for many years I tried to secure from the office of Mr. Hopkins some slight cooperation in my earnest attempt to take politics out of the administration of W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. Mr. Hopkins gave me no help. All he would do was to make slighting references to me, saying, "You cannot expect me to turn handsprings every time Senator Davis makes a political charge." Seeking to cover up his own administration, he accused me of political partisanship.

I should be unfair to Mr. Hopkins and to my own constituents if I lost this opportunity to say that my interest in the unemployed then, as now, was not that of a political partisan. I have voted for all work-relief and public-works appropriations. I voted for W. P. A. appropriations, although I knew they were being used to build up a political machine in Pennsylvania for the purpose of defeating me. I frequently stated this on the floor of the Senate and throughout the State of Pennsylvania. However, that political machine became so arrogant and so thoroughly degraded that the citizens of Pennsylvania, including thousands of men and women on W. P. A. rolls who had been insulted by the treatment they had received, rose up in rebellion against the machine and registered a stern verdict against it on November 8.

I have been increasingly confirmed in a profound conviction that partisan politics should not be tolerated in the administration of relief, work relief, or any form of social-security legislation. Despite a manifest public opinion on this subject, the representative of Mr. Hopkins at Harrisburg, Pa., has not uttered a single protest against the partisan conditions under his administration; nor has Aubrey Williams, his chief deputy, recanted a single word he spoke during the recent campaign, although Mr. Hopkins has apologized for him.

Mr. President, I do not wish to indict the intelligence of Mr. Hopkins by saying that he did not know what was going on in W. P. A. in the great State of Pennsylvania. He had every opportunity of knowing. He could have known if he had wanted to know, and I do not think he has been in Washington for 6 years without knowing the work-relief problems of our State. At no time, however, until he was called before the committee considering his nomination have I heard of him indicating his clear recognition and sure condemnation of these abuses.

I do not wish to judge the motives of Mr. Hopkins in obscuring the partisan developments in W. P. A. I can only take him at his own word when he now says that he regrets the intrusion of partisan politics into the great public trust committed to him. I am glad that he has admitted the truth of these findings, and that he does not seek to deny the evidences of fraud, voter coercion, and dissipated public funds shown in the report of the Senatorial Campaign Expenditures Committee. At last he has adopted an attitude becoming in a public servant. Mr. Hopkins is now like the repentant sinner who, through his tears, can find courage to sing:

Yield not to temptation, for yielding is sin.

The apparent ease with which he makes these admissions has not increased my confidence in him. However, it is my sincere hope that should he now be confirmed he will take to his new official responsibility a more certain respect for the public opinion of the American people.

Mr. President, the document I now hold in my hand is ample proof of wicked practices of voter coercion in W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. The temporary activities of the conscientious Senate committee investigating campaign expenditures has given insight as to what may be expected when a complete investigation is made. I shall not cease my insistence on this point. W. P. A. must be fully investigated. The public is entitled to know how much has been spent for administrative overhead, to whom it was paid, what work they did, and why some were discharged while others were retained at princely salaries at a time when tens of thousands of heads of families were driven from the rolls immediately after election day, or in the pitiless cold of winter.

Mr. President, I am not for further cuts in W. P. A. at this time. This is not the time, in the dead of winter, to drive workers from the rolls. Snow has fallen in Pennsylvania. In thousands of homes there are no shoes for the children, no suitable clothing, but little food in the kitchen, and little fuel for warmth. If such were the case in my home, I would seek the work opportunities necessary to protect it, and I believe my fellow citizens have the same right.

I repeat, however, that W. P. A. must be fully and completely investigated. I should not like to believe the current rumor that the removal of Mr. Hopkins from W. P. A. was designed primarily to stop such an investigation. I carry an order from the voters of Pennsylvania as of last November 8 demanding that W. P. A. be cleaned up. The voters do not want a whitewash. They do not want the self-investigation of W. P. A. such as Mr. Hopkins has conducted. They want W. P. A. purged from top to bottom. Nothing less than a complete investigation of W. P. A. will satisfy the taxpayers of this Nation.

I was among the first, if not the first Member of the Senate, some 4 years ago to ask for a full investigation of W. P. A. I did so for a number of reasons. I desired a rethinking of the principles on which public work is administered. I desired to remove partisanship from the administration of relief and work relief. I desired a thorough examination of the admin-

istrative costs of public work. We shall not come to a satisfactory solution of these questions until W. P. A. is fully investigated. Such an investigation has an importance far higher than any partisan claim, and deserves the support of every patriotic American citizen.

The report in my hand is only the beginning. Mr. President, let me repeat, this is only the beginning. At a later date I expect to present additional evidence which will, I believe, make a complete investigation of W. P. A. imperative at the source of expenditures in every State in the Union.

Mr. President, I conclude. In view of the facts which I have reviewed, I shall not vote for the confirmation of Mr. Hopkins. If I should do so I should be kept busy from now until my dying day in unsatisfactory explanations.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the affidavit of Mary E. Lucot, of Pittsburgh. She was formerly chief clerk in the office of the W. P. A. of Allegheny County, which had charge of all projects operated in the boroughs, townships, and third-class cities. Seven weeks before the day when she made this affidavit she was discharged because she refused to purchase W. P. A. tickets for the Hershey picnic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CONNALLY. Before consent is given, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether this affidavit attacking W. P. A. was made while this lady was still working for the W. P. A. or after she had been discharged.

Mr. DAVIS. It is filed in the confidential report of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is offering it. I merely desired to know whether she made the affidavit while she was still working for the W. P. A.

Mr. DAVIS. No; after she had been discharged from the W. P. A.

Mr. CONNALLY. After she lost her job she made the affidavit?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct—after she was discharged for political reasons.

Mr. BARKLEY. In this affidavit did she state she was discharged for political reasons?

Mr. DAVIS. No; I do not think she did say that.

Mr. BARKLEY. If she was discharged for political reasons, she must have been discharged by the W. P. A., and if they discharged her for political reasons, or because of her political activity, does the Senator complain of that?

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator think anyone down in Kentucky is going to make the statement that he knows he is going to be discharged for political reasons? They will not do that in Pennsylvania. They wait until the action is taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know a great many of them who were discharged for reasons entirely legitimate who afterward made affidavits that they were dismissed for political reasons.

Mr. DAVIS. I know some who were discharged just for political reasons, when the W. P. A. had no legitimate right to discharge them on that ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether the affidavit directly connects Mr. Hopkins with the matter that is set forth in it.

Mr. DAVIS. It does not mention Mr. Hopkins' name. It mentions W. P. A. and the officers in Allegheny County, Pa. For the benefit of the Senate, I ask that the clerk read the affidavit, if that course is agreeable to Senators, so that they may have the full information as to what is contained in the affidavit. Mr. President, I ask that the affidavit be read by the clerk.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the affidavit need not be read into the RECORD in order to satisfy the purpose of my taking the floor. I wish to inform the Senator that I did not intend to object to its being read into the RECORD. I was simply

seeking a little information, because the returns from Pennsylvania led me to conclude that everyone, including the W. P. A., had voted the Republican ticket in that State, and I was wondering whether the Senator from Pennsylvania was dissatisfied with the result.

Mr. DAVIS. For the information of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and my very good friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania include me among his very good friends also? Why does the Senator discriminate between the Senator from West Virginia and me? [Laughter.]

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I call attention to a rule of the Senate, a rule which is important, that before a Senator may speak he must be recognized by the Chair. That rule is constantly being violated by Senators on the floor who ought to know the rules. So far as the Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned, he does not need to make a request for unanimous consent to have the affidavit read. He can read it in his own right, under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] originally asked that an affidavit be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The affidavit is as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

The following affidavit was filed with Senator SHEPPARD, chairman, Senate Campaign Expenditures Committee:

OFFICE OF SENATOR JAMES J. DAVIS,
November 2, 1938.

[Copy]

THE REPUBLICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD W. P. A.

(By Mary E. Lucot)

(Mary E. Lucot was formerly chief clerk of the office of the W. P. A. of Allegheny County, which had charge of all projects operated in the boroughs, townships, and third-class cities. Seven weeks ago she was fired because she refused to purchase W. P. A. tickets for the Hershey picnic.)

As chief clerk of the office which had charge of all projects operating in the boroughs, townships, and third-class cities in Allegheny County, I am qualified to write of conditions which have existed during my 2½ years in that office. As chief clerk, I kept a record of approximately 200 projects. From 110 to 125 of these were in actual operation at all times. I wrote every requisition for the assignment of labor orders, skilled and supervisory men, for these projects.

If the W. P. A. office in Allegheny County is investigated, the stench of favoritism and politics in its administration will far surpass the scandal at Harrisburg.

Federal funds are used injudiciously to promote the financial chests of the Democratic Party in Allegheny County.

In July of this year I personally made a trip to Harrisburg and advised Mr. J. Banks Hudson, State administrator of W. P. A., of the conditions which exist in the Allegheny County office. Mr. Hudson knows these facts to be true.

I saw honest, competent, and efficient men refused work, due solely to their political standing or to the fact that the ward chairman preferred to place his own workers in these positions. Political bosses were not concerned about whether a man was able to perform the work which was set up to be done by appropriated Federal funds, but only what they could get out of the men for the next election.

During the election of the mayor in the city of Pittsburgh in 1937, we purged the W. P. A. rolls of all men who had been sponsored by John Kane, county commissioner, who was supporting P. J. McArdle against C. D. Scully. We substituted and assigned in their places organization men by the scores and the organization supported Mr. Scully who was the victor, for it was not possible to beat the organization pay roll within its own rights. However, Mr. Waddell, the Republican candidate for mayor, had stiffer opposition, for after the primaries, all the Democrats were once more "sweethearts."

During October and November of 1937, the two heavy campaign months, W. P. A. aided considerably but this time we were opposing the Republican Party and heavier fuel was added to the mixture. We took hundreds of cases from the relief rolls and assigned them to W. P. A. pay rolls. The manning on city streets alone jumped over 1,000 men. All this was done to help the Democratic Party keep control of the city of Pittsburgh. If the manning of W. P. A. had been checked 30 days previous to this election day with the pay rolls as they were reduced 30 days later, you could verify that the W. P. A. rolls had been padded for election day.

Allegheny County has a quota of men that has been set up by the State office to take care of W. P. A. work within the county. An accurate check will show that we kept within that figure during most of the year and that the discrepancy occurs only during the election period.

The Guffey-Earle machine also may resort to other means for winning an election if increasing the load and assigning choice supervisory positions fail. Harrisburg is contacted and we get an official notice, signed by Mr. J. Banks Hudson, to suspend all work on election day, said work to be made up at a later date, and thus all the ward bosses are given a chance to use their W. P. A. appointees at the polls and they see that those on the relief rolls in their particular balliwick get taken to the polls in cars.

If W. P. A. workers were given an opportunity to work 40-44 hours per week, 52 weeks of the year, 95 percent of them would be honest and efficient. They would give as much to their work as any man in private industry. I have talked with and questioned more than 2,000 men on the W. P. A. Ninety-five percent of them are dissatisfied with their present wage and working conditions.

(5) W. P. A. employees are supposed to receive a notice, coming from Washington, before every election. This notice is expected previous to the election. However, during the recent primary campaign, we received this notice 2 days after the election and it stated that at no time were we to coerce or intimidate any Federal employee and that the knowledge of such would result in our immediate dismissal. They failed to send notices to the political bosses and ward heelers who were coercing and intimidating the W. P. A. workers. We were given permission to vote independently but 99 percent of those employed on the administrative and supervisory pay rolls are well aware of this fact. They know this is the usual form letter and is to be treated as such.

If the administrators of W. P. A. took this election notice seriously, would they tolerate the distribution of the Hershey State picnic tickets in the old Federal post-office building to W. P. A. workers? You answer "no." But those tickets were distributed in this building and were handed to the officials themselves during W. P. A. work hours.

If W. P. A. administrators took their election notice seriously would they lend to outside agencies, men charged to the Federal pay roll, to distribute tickets to the supervisory personnel? Would they personally O. K. the travel expense accounts of these men, working on Government time, for this purpose? You answer "They should not." But I know they did. Would they condone the collecting of moneys for these same tickets by Federal employees during office hours and knowingly permit them to tell you that they thought it would be much better if you paid for them rather than to turn them back? They actually did this after the State picnic in Hershey Park.

Would officials in the building permit certain individuals to take their tickets out to the various work locations and sell them to the laborers and skilled men in order that they would not have to dig into their own pockets for their share of the graft, which is and has been carried by the W. P. A. employees?

In the face of these questions do you think that Governor Earle and Senator GUFFEY, who connive with others to make W. P. A. workers, are fit men to control the destiny of our State? Should they, by the control which they exercise over the public pay roll, be permitted to tell us who will be our candidates for Governor and United States Senator?

During the May primaries Senator GUFFEY appealed to W. P. A. workers to nominate an honest man for Governor and not a hand-picked candidate of David Lawrence. Now Mr. GUFFEY is telling the W. P. A. workers to support the same candidate he then opposed. Was Mr. GUFFEY right in May or is he right now?

During these same May primaries, through the influence of Senator GUFFEY, the assignment division in Allegheny County worked strenuously for 2 or 3 weeks to assign some 5,000 to 6,000 on W. P. A. rolls. This necessitated additional supervision which was passed to the Kennedy-Guffey supporters. Some of the supervision on W. P. A. projects went from laborers at \$60.50 or C. L. F. at \$85 to general foreman at \$1,800-\$2,160. It was not a question of qualifications or ability but one of political strategy. Some of the Kennedy-Guffey workers who thought to make a good showing on their application stated that they had experience with the Casey Construction Co., extending from 1 to 20 years. These statements were checked and fraud was uncovered on 14 out of 15 applications.

When Mr. Kennedy was defeated in the primaries, we purged our rolls of 6,000 men within 3 weeks, in order to get down once more to quota. This should have automatically reduced our supervision, but everyone was in doubt as to who should be discharged. Should it be the recently appointed Kennedy workers or should it be the old organization men who did not go along with the Guffey purge? The consequence was that for many weeks we carried a supervisory roll far in excess of that needed.

Judge Arthur James and Senator JAMES J. DAVIS have signed a public statement, together with other Republican candidates, promising a full continuation of W. P. A. until jobs can be provided through private employment. This is the outstanding issue of this campaign and the Republican position on it is clear and satisfactory to W. P. A. workers. The Republican Party promises that workers will not be stuck on W. P. A. rolls and then dropped as the Earle gang has done. The constructive attitude toward W. P. A. should be endorsed at the polls by every fair-minded voter.

Senator DAVIS states that "A bill should be introduced into the Senate of the United States to brand political macing as a crime punishable with a \$5,000 fine for any man who seeks to extort even as much as one thin dime from a W. P. A. worker or forces the purchase of \$100 a plate dinners from Government employees." When this bill becomes the law of the land, the disgraceful con-

dition of political macing, which now prevails in Pennsylvania, will be removed.

I expect to vote Republican November 8 and ask my many old-time associates and friends on W. P. A. to vote for Arthur James for Governor and Senator JAMES J. DAVIS for United States Senator.

MARY E. LUCOT.

2901 Middletown Road, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 1st day of November 1938 by Mary E. Lucot.

[SEAL]

(Signed) N. M. GAERTNER, Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 30, 1941.)

Mr. HOLT obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HOLT. Yes. I am enjoying the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. A while ago, when I asked the Senator to yield, and he declined, he was stating in his address that he was satisfied and actually charging Mr. Hopkins with knowing the condition which he described in Pennsylvania. If the Senator insists on that attitude, then he disagrees with the Senate committee, which in its official report exonerated Mr. Hopkins from any knowledge or responsibility in connection with any of these matters that were criticized by the committee in the States referred to.

Mr. DAVIS. I am expressing my opinion that that is the opinion of the Senate committee. The district representative of Mr. Hopkins in Pennsylvania certainly knew about it. Mr. Aubrey Williams certainly knew about it in Pennsylvania. And I said I did not want to indict him in a way to show that he did not know what was going on in his office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then by not being willing to indict Mr. Hopkins, the Senator is willing to indict the Senate committee for making the report.

Mr. DAVIS. No; I am not willing to indict the Senate committee. I say the Senate committee did an excellent job.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. They said that Mr. Hopkins knew nothing about this and was in no way responsible for it. The Senator disagrees with the committee?

Mr. DAVIS. I disagree with the committee on that point because of the fact that on many occasions I have called incidents to the attention of Mr. Hopkins, and Mr. Hopkins said that he could not turn a handspring every time I brought in the political question of W. P. A. and relief.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, we are here to discuss the question of a Christmas present. It was said in the newspapers, and reliably said, that the President of the United States had given a Christmas present to Mr. Hopkins, whom he affectionately calls "Harry the Hop," as he calls Mr. Morgenthau "Henry the Morgue," and Mr. Corcoran "Tommy the Cork"—

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator spoke the name "Henry"—did he refer to me?

Mr. HOLT. No; I do not refer to my distinguished and good friend from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator said "Henry the Morgue."

Mr. HOLT. I do not refer to the Senator from Arizona, because I am sure he is not "Henry the Morgue"—he is very much alive. [Laughter.]

However, it is a known fact that the President gave the Secretaryship of Commerce to Mr. Hopkins as a Christmas present. I believe a large number of the American people would not accept Mr. Hopkins even on a Christmas tree. [Laughter in the galleries.] However, I do not doubt that he will be confirmed, because Mr. Hopkins has played ball with too many Democrats not to be confirmed. I should like to express and will express my opinion about the man in my address this afternoon.

Jefferson some time ago—known as the father of the Democratic Party, but lately known as the forgotten man of the Democratic Party, and particularly he was the forgotten man that was spoken of in the 1932 campaign—Jefferson made the statement that the question concerning a candidate shall be, "Is he honest, is he capable, is he faithful to the Constitution?" In my opinion I can answer all three

LXXXIV—31

of those questions with a definite negative, "No." I do not believe that he is honest. I do not believe that he is capable. Nor do I believe he is faithful to the Constitution. I am in a little better position to make such an assertion than a number of Senators on this side of the aisle. I do not have any job to lose, and I may make that assertion. I was looking through the Congressional Directory as to the official duties of the Department of Commerce. Oh, there are quite a number of duties in the Department of Commerce. I shall not read them all, but on page 573 I found out why the President has appointed Mr. Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce. One of those duties is listed as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce is charged with the work of—

What?—

the supervision and control of Alaskan fur seal, salmon, and other fisheries.

I do not know of any man in America who should be more qualified to regulate the Alaskan fur seals than Mr. Hopkins, because he has done a great deal of boondoggling, and no doubt in his boondoggling ventures he has studied the Alaskan fur seal. Some of the Works Progress Administration workers even went back to Pharaoh's time, and before, in Egypt to trace the history of the safety-pin. So I am sure that Mr. Hopkins has traced down something of the history of the Alaskan fur seal and is perfectly at ease in determining what shall be done about it.

I do not want to be facetious, particularly now. I want to read a very excellent summary about Mr. Hopkins appearing in the Baltimore Sun this morning written by Frank R. Kent. I shall amplify it, but I think it summarizes the matter very well. It is entitled "The Hopkins Ballyhoo."

I want to read it, because I am sure that a number of Senators would like to hear it:

If the interesting effort to build Mr. Harry Hopkins, newly appointed Secretary of Commerce, up into a solid and reassuring figure in whom businessmen will confide and in whose behalf his influence will be benevolently exerted—if that effort has begun to bog down, it is not the fault of the administration propagandists.

Certainly they have done their best. The basic cause of the failure can be traced back to that trenchant, ancient, but still appallingly accurate saying, to wit, that "you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear."

How true, how true!

While it is true that an extraordinary concentration of the New Deal political and publicity forces succeeded in pulling him through a hearing where the clarity of his memory about not having uttered his famous spend, spend, tax, tax, elect, elect remark was only equaled by the amazing foggiest which made him uncertain that he had ever said, among other things, that Upton Sinclair is "one of us," or that he had ever been enrolled as a Socialist—nevertheless, the Senate gauntlet rubbed off a good deal of the grease with which the heroic Harry had been anointed.

He will enter upon his new job with the White House journalistic reflectors almost tearfully insisting upon his noble personal character, his great executive ability, and many admirable qualities of mind and heart. The chorus, however, is a little too loud; its synthetic nature slightly too apparent; the butter much too thick. Mr. Hopkins' W. P. A. record, Mr. Hopkins' testimony, and the points made about Mr. Hopkins in the Senate and outside stand him out far too clearly to permit the picture to be blurred by propaganda or the actual facts to be hidden from the people as a whole.

Outstanding among these is that Mr. Hopkins was not taken from the W. P. A. and put into the Cabinet as a deserved promotion, but to get him out of a job which he had badly botched and into a place where he would be out of the line of fire. That is the plain truth and there isn't an informed man in Washington who does not know it.

I intended to discuss that question a little later. At present I continue the reading of Mr. Kent's article:

As for the botching, the evidence—some of it provided by Mr. Hopkins himself—is overwhelming and convincing. As he leaves, Congress prepares to dismantle and revamp the whole relief set-up. It does this after the political saturation of the W. P. A. has been disclosed by a Senate committee, and partially admitted by Mr. Hopkins; after it has been denounced by both Democrats and Republicans, and after public sentiment has reached the limit of tolerance.

The job of forming a new system of relief administration, about to be tackled by Congress, is not recommended either by the President or Mr. Hopkins. On the contrary, neither has as yet made the slightest constructive suggestion, and until Mr. Hopkins admitted certain things on the stand, including his own mistaken political activities, the attitude of both had been that W. P. A. was

without a flaw and that all charges were partisan and unfounded. The situation as it exists today, with Mr. Hopkins taken out as a precaution against attack, his aide, Mr. Aubrey Williams, side-tracked for similar reasons, and the whole structure itself about to be made over, is about as complete an indictment as could be framed.

Under the circumstances, to sing the praises of Mr. Hopkins is to be ridiculous. However, that does not deter the administration minstrels who are thoroughly aware that in saving Mr. Hopkins' face they also save the President's. The tune upon which they now harp is that Mr. Hopkins was really urged for Secretary of Commerce by big-business leaders who believe in him. This is simply not true. There were no detached business leaders who urged his selection or wanted it. The idea of making him Secretary of Commerce originated in no business mind, but was evolved by the slick palace politicians, of whom he is one, as a way out of the W. P. A. jam which made his retention there impossible.

The position he now occupies is the least important of all Cabinet posts—

And am I glad of that!—

far less important, of course, than that of W. P. A. Administrator, which he relinquishes. But to justify the advance notices tentative plans have been formed to have Mr. Hopkins expand into a sort of superlabor peacemaker and otherwise avoid sinking into what might prove humiliating obscurity.

I am reminded of the President's desire for anonymity in certain of his officers. If he leaves Harry Hopkins alone, the appointee will sink into that anonymous position, and, as Mr. Kent says, he will sink into "humiliating obscurity."

They will not amount to much. Actually Mr. Hopkins is the complete "yes man," the most subservient whom the President has in Washington, which may account for the high favor in which he holds him.

It has taken an administration drive of major proportions to get him safely into the new job where his power is curtailed, his importance diminished, and his usefulness to the opposition as a target decreased. But neither the strained tributes of the business stooges of the so-called advisory council, the "great American" adjectives of his jobholding colleagues, nor the encomiums of his gifted chief can make of him a public official whom the harried businessman will trust or love. In the graphic words of an old-time politician, no businessman not wholly foolish "would ever go to sleep with his finger in Harry's mouth."

That is the end of Mr. Kent's article. Of course, I would not try to add to it, but I desire to amplify it to some extent. I might read all afternoon about Mr. Hopkins, and what the people of the country think of him. However, I wish only to read a few references from some of the newspapers of the country about this so-called great Secretary of Commerce, who, as Secretary of Commerce, is going to settle all our labor troubles.

I invite attention first to an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I emphasize the word "Democrat":

President Roosevelt's selection of Harry L. Hopkins to assume the Cabinet post vacated by Commerce Secretary Daniel C. Roper is purely a political act and reflects a dismal disregard for national welfare. Scrutiny of Mr. Hopkins' record reveals no qualifications for the job. His business experience is nil, and his conduct as head of the Works Progress Administration has been the New Deal's most arrogant example of shameful political exploitation.

I shall not read more from that editorial. Let me go to the Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette, a Democratic newspaper, which says:

As Secretary of Commerce the W. P. A. Administrator will be taken out of his life work and made responsible for work of a totally different kind, in which he has had no training or experience.

The Reno (Nev.) Gazette labels its editorial about Mr. Hopkins' appointment "Silencing an Inquiry."

Not a man in the Senate who knows the facts will deny that one of the reasons why President Roosevelt named Harry Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce was to stop an investigation of the Works Progress Administration, and in order that the administration cohorts on the floor, when we start to discuss the W. P. A. and Mr. Hopkins, may say, "Well, you are discussing something in the past. Mr. Hopkins is gone. What are you talking about?" We all know that that was one of the chief reasons why he was kicked upstairs. He was kicked upstairs by the President in order to avoid an exposé of the most shameful conduct that has ever been known by any official who has had his power.

I could go ahead and read many articles. The Lansing (Mich.) Journal labels its editorial "Hopkins Offends Common Sense."

Turning to the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, its editorial starts with this language:

The appointment of Harry Hopkins as Secretary of Commerce is remarkable from several aspects. Next to the naming of Hugo Black—

I think some Senators will remember him.

Next to the naming of Hugo Black to the Supreme Court, it is probably the most unfit appointment the President has yet made. By neither training nor experience is Hopkins acquainted with the problems which arise in the Commerce Department; nor is it likely he has much sympathy for them.

Another Democratic newspaper is the Galveston Tribune. The label of its editorial is "Mr. Hopkins Gets a Christmas Present." The editorial goes on to say:

In the eyes of some it would be difficult to find a man less qualified for the post of Secretary of Commerce than Harry Hopkins.

The Colorado Springs (Colo.) Gazette labels its editorial about Mr. Hopkins "Unfit But Safe." The editorial begins thus:

Harry Hopkins is probably the most unpopular man the President could name to the Department of Commerce.

The editorial from the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram is labeled "Christmas Gift for Senators." It states:

It was 2 days before Christmas, and all through the land not a politician was thinking of anything more serious than turkey and fixings, when President Roosevelt yesterday shoved Santa Claus from the center of the stage by appointing Harry L. Hopkins to the Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. What chance has an old fellow like Santa against a man who has won the title of "Biggest Spender on Earth"?

I shall not read more from that editorial. I should like to quote a sentence from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, Mass., which labels its editorial "An Uncommercial Secretary." The first sentence of that editorial is:

Never has there been an American Secretary of Commerce with less of a private business background than Harry L. Hopkins.

As I stated a moment ago, I could read at great length from newspaper comments, both Democratic and Republican, about Mr. Hopkins. We have in this country a poll known as the American Institute of Public Opinion, otherwise known as the Gallup poll. On December 16 the Gallup poll, named after Dr. George Gallup, its director, was taken to determine whether the people of the United States wanted Harry Hopkins to succeed Roper. The Gallup poll showed that 66 percent of the people of the United States felt that Hopkins should not be named as Secretary of Commerce.

Different individuals throughout the country were asked, Do you think Harry Hopkins has done a good job in the W. P. A.? The majority, or 53 percent, felt that he had not done a good job.

A number of businessmen were asked whether they thought Harry Hopkins would be a good Secretary of Commerce. Only 22 percent of the businessmen of America felt that Harry Hopkins would be a good Secretary of Commerce and 78 percent thought that he would not be a good Secretary. Of course, the office of Secretary of Commerce was created to help business and evaluate business conditions. Mr. Hopkins is utterly unfit for that; and, although I desire to discuss this a little later on in my very, very short speech, I should like, since I have mentioned the Gallup polls, to refer to the Gallup poll which was published on June 19, 1938. The headline is "New Deal injecting politics into relief, poll voters believe." It shows that 54 percent of the people actually believed that politics had been injected into the W. P. A. It also shows that of that entire group 91 percent objected to the use of politics in relief. Of course, we have heard that Mr. Hopkins has repented. Oh, yes. His appearance and conduct before the committee reminded me of the instance of a man who was caught and found guilty of stealing something, who goes before the judge and says, "Judge, I did not mean to do it at all; I will not do it again if you will just let me off." So that is practically what Mr.

Hopkins says: "I did not mean to do this; I think it was wrong; but if you will just give me another lease on life and \$15,000 a year"—that is thrown in—"If you will just give me that, I will be a good boy and will make political speeches only when they have the approval of most of the Senators, whether they be purged or not."

Referring to the hearing, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] asked him what he thought about a statement Mr. Williams made on June 27 in which Mr. Williams said, "We have got to stick together; we have got to keep our friends in power." Mr. Hopkins said that that was an indiscretion on the part of Mr. Williams.

Now let me compare what Mr. Williams said with what Mr. Hopkins said in September. Mr. Williams said—and I repeat it, and then I want to inquire which was worse, and I ask Senators to listen—Mr. Williams said in June, "We have got to stick together; we have got to keep our friends in power." Here, however, is what Mr. Hopkins said, according to the Associated Press in September 1938 at New Ulm, Minn.—and I quote from the press dispatch:

NEW ULM, MINN., September 13.—Harry Hopkins, Federal Works Progress Administration chieftain, toured local W. P. A. projects today after declaring "It is—

This is Mr. Hopkins speaking.

"It is perfectly proper in a democracy for relief to become a political issue."

The article goes on:

Addressing 100 civic officials and businessmen last night, Mr. Hopkins said: "There is nothing wrong in supporting the political group that will give you the most."

Listen to that:

There is nothing wrong in supporting the political group that will give you the most.

Mr. Williams said—

We have got to stick together; we have got to keep our friends in power.

Let the Senate determine which statement is worse. One was made by Mr. Williams in June and the other was made by Mr. Hopkins in September. Mr. Hopkins is the man who wanted to keep politics out of relief, and yet he made that statement in his speech. Perhaps he thought it was just one of those times when he was "playing around" about which he spoke. It will be recalled he said he might have made it while he was "playing around," but he never defined what he meant by that. I do not know what he meant, but, nevertheless, the Associated Press got this particular statement and I am going to quote a little further from it. This is Mr. Hopkins still speaking:

Relief is a good issue—

He said—

and should be debated. The public is demanding more and more service from its Government and should elect candidates that will give it to them.

Oh, it was wrong for Mr. Williams to say it; Mr. Hopkins said it was indiscreet for Mr. Williams to say it. I ask which statement was worse?

Then he proceeds:

I am no more worried about relief clients becoming a pressure group than I am about school teachers organizing for higher wages or Andrew Mellon lobbying for an aluminum tariff or the cement manufacturers for paved roads—

He added.

So, Mr. Hopkins feels that there should be no politics in relief; at least, that is what he has now said, and he criticizes Mr. Williams for making the statement to which I have referred.

Here is something else he said—and I quote from his testimony in the nomination hearing. He said:

Senator, I am the last man to try to avoid either responsibility or to seem to quibble about politics in relief. I do not think it is funny. I do not think the American people like it. I know you do not like it, Senator, because ever since I have been here never once have you ever by any implication attempted to even, directly or indirectly, have anything to do with W. P. A. or with anything I have ever done about politics.

In other words, he said in his statement when he appeared before the men who are to pass on his nomination that he does not think it funny to quibble about politics and relief. He did not tell them that he delivered a speech in Minnesota about which the committee did not know and which was not given to any members of the committee and which happened to be found by me as I plowed through the record of Mr. Hopkins. It is all right to play politics in Minnesota, but when his side gets licked in the election and when he cannot "purge" those he desired to purge, and when he wants to be Secretary of Commerce then he puts on his saintly air, his hypocritical cloak, and says, "Gentlemen, I have done wrong, but I shall be a good boy from now on if you will just excuse me once again."

I could proceed and show a number of things from the hearing, but I do not think it is necessary to read all of them. I should like, however, to read some of the questions regarding Mr. Hopkins' activity in the 1938 campaign. I quote from the hearings, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. I will remind you of what you said and where you said it.

It would be necessary to do that, and then, when it was done, his memory would become very bad and he would not remember saying it at all, even though he would be told where he said it.

You said it at Hyde Park, after having seen His Excellency the President, that the New Deal would make a clean sweep and "you can take my word for it that Governor Murphy will be elected by 500,000 majority."

That was not the first time Mr. Hopkins has been wrong; but Mr. Hopkins had to quibble about that. Here is what he says:

Mr. HOPKINS. I do not recall the 500,000, but I was awfully sure that Murphy was going to win.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a matter of being sure; it is a matter of making a political declaration as the head of an organization that permeated the whole country and that was dispensing public money and getting out projects.

Mr. HOPKINS. I did not consider that I was making a political speech at all. Everybody in the United States was discussing the election.

Including, I may say, Mr. Hopkins.

Some newspaperman asked me how I thought Michigan was coming out, and I probably said I thought it was "in the bag."

"In the bag"! Another instance will be remembered, the newspapermen asked Mr. Hopkins a question as to what he thought about the Iowa election, and he said that if he were in Iowa he would vote for Mr. Wearin; and then when he was questioned about it he said, "I just said that off the record to the newspapermen." So he said "off the record" that Michigan was "in the bag."

I should have consulted Senator VANDENBERG, first, because I should have known better than to make such a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had consulted your better thoughts as you have expressed them this morning, you would not have made that statement?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am not sure about that. I think that is a little different. I was not urging that Murphy be elected. I was simply doing something that all of us do—guessing about politics.

I wonder if he guessed about South Carolina and Georgia, and I may add Maryland, also.

The CHAIRMAN. We will let you have your view about it. We fellows who are probably more political than you are—I don't know—

Even the Chairman expressed a doubt—

think that predictions are meant in some degree as expressions of wishes. You did not think of that at all?

Mr. HOPKINS. No; I did not. That certainly did not cross my mind.

He did not think that anybody would be interested. The newspapermen just asked him that question, and it did not even cross his mind that the newspapers asked him that for any political reason. Is not that peculiar?

The CHAIRMAN. You did not think that that would rally the boys?

Mr. HOPKINS. No. I would have been very sure it would not; certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. You did make a statement about the New Deal sweeping the whole western country through which you traveled. What was the basis of that?

Mr. HOPKINS. I saw a great many people when I was out West, public officials, and had many, many discussions out there.

Then he tells about that. I read further:

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you stop?

Mr. HOPKINS. I stopped in Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a contest on there?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes. I guessed that one badly—wrong.

Yes; I would say he guessed it wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. You were supporting—

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, wait a minute, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the Senator's name who got beat out there—Benson?

Mr. HOPKINS. The party has not had a Senator there for quite a while.

The CHAIRMAN. Benson was Senator and then got to be Governor and then got beat this past year?

Mr. HOPKINS. He was not a Democrat.

The CHAIRMAN. No; he was a Farmer-Labor. But the Democratic Party has been supporting the Farmer-Labor candidates out there.

Mr. HOPKINS. I don't know about that.

That is the reason—because members of the Democratic Party in Minnesota in some instances are anti-New Deal, but he did not tell the committee about that; those are the ones he did not consult.

The CHAIRMAN. You went to Minnesota where there was a contest on, and you got some political information there. You evidently talked with the politicians.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Democratic State chairman came to see me.

The CHAIRMAN. And you told him, "We are going to sweep the country?"

Mr. HOPKINS. No, sir.

He did not say he spoke in New Ulm, Minn., where he told the people that they should elect those who gave them the most. Oh, no, no, no; that was not politics at all!

Now, he left Minnesota, and he went on out farther West.

Mr. HOPKINS. No; quite the contrary. He was very sure they were going to get whipped in Minnesota. I then went on to South Dakota.

Is not that peculiar? There was an election for Senator in South Dakota. Check the places where he stopped and see where the senatorial elections were. I just ask you to do it. I would not imply that he stopped for any political reason. He stopped to see how they were getting along on the project out there. Of course, he could do that on the train.

I then went on to South Dakota.

There was an election there.

I went from there to North Dakota.

And there was an election there. Mr. Hopkins is not saying this. I am putting in the words "and there was an election there." Do not get wrong about that. He did not admit it.

I went from there to Montana and stayed only a few minutes there.

Of course, there was not a contest for Congress there in which he was interested—oh, no!

I went to Washington.

Then the chairman said:

There was a contest on in Montana, was there not?

Mr. HOPKINS. I had no part in that of any kind or description.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see any of the candidates?

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, yes; they came to see me.

What is the difference between his going to see them and the other way? You can determine that.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the names.

Mr. HOPKINS. I recall Jerry O'Connell—

So do a number of us here recall him; but he has also gone to the Great Beyond. He probably will get an appointment of some kind; but, nevertheless, Mr. Hopkins says:

I recall Jerry O'Connell coming down to the train to meet me.

Did Senator WHEELER come down?

I saw Senator MURRAY.

Why? Who controls the patronage there? Check who controls the patronage, who controls the politics in the W. P. A., and then see who consulted Mr. Hopkins on his "non-political" trip throughout the country. You can be the judge. I do not have to tell you.

I saw Frank Walker's brother, who was running for supreme court judge out there, and I think I met the candidate for sheriff.

No, no; he just stopped there, you know. There was not any politics at all in Montana, but for some particular reason he did not take the time to call on Senator WHEELER. You can judge why he did not call on Senator WHEELER; but he did have a discussion with Jerry O'Connell. He did not have a discussion with the Montana Representative who defeated Mr. O'Connell.

The chairman said:

I am surprised that all the candidates did not come to see you.

Mr. HOPKINS. I was probably there 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a man in authority. You could say to one, "Go," and he goes, and to another one, "Come," and he comes. I am not surprised that they came to see you. But you were not looking for them?

Mr. HOPKINS. No.

This is what he was doing: He stopped in South Dakota, where there was a contest for Senator. He stopped in North Dakota, where there was a contest for Senator. He stopped in Minnesota, where they were interested. He stopped in Montana and Washington, where they had very important elections; but this is what he was doing: Do you know what he was doing out there?

The CHAIRMAN. You were just looking after the W. P. A. in those States?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes. I had no interest in the political situation and took no part whatever.

Oh, Mr. Hopkins took no part in those particular elections. Anybody may believe that who wants to, but RUSH HOLT does not. [Laughter.] RUSH HOLT knows that Mr. Hopkins was clear up to his neck and probably in his mouth, because some of his clerks made political gestures around it, anyway; and he was out in the West playing politics to defeat anybody who would not take orders from the White House.

Why was it, when the distinguished and a most outstanding Member of the Senate from Georgia was a candidate for renomination, that Mr. Hopkins had particular business in the State of Georgia? You can guess why. Why was it, when the Florida election was on, that he had business in Florida? He was just "looking after projects." Oh, yes; I admit he was "looking after projects"—the projects that W. P. A. wanted to complete—namely, political control. That was the project he was looking after.

Why was it that he became very much interested in many of these trips where the "purgees" were to be purged? Oh, he was looking after projects down there. Why was it that he was interested in any place where the New Deal was having a particularly hard battle? Of course you can decide that just as well as I. You know, and, in my opinion, there is not a man here who honestly and sincerely does not believe, that Harry Hopkins was talking politics on those trips to the West and the South, and any point that would help Harry Hopkins stay in power. He was in politics, as I said a moment ago, up to his neck. Where he went the people just put it on over his head and buried it; but I must go ahead with this particular hearing. You know, he was quoted as saying that "We will spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect." Oh, yes; he denied it. Oh, yes; I admit Mr. Hopkins denied it, but he also denied that there was any politics in relief, too.

Mr. Hopkins is the greatest denier this country has ever known. The first action that he took in the Department of Commerce was to deny a story. He started in all right; there is no question about that. Mr. Hopkins has denied, and denied with gusto, and I may say with particular finesse, every single thing where he was in a hole. He is the great denier; there is no question about that. Does anyone doubt that the statement "We will spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect," was made by Mr. Hopkins, after knowing his political philosophy? In other words, if he did not

actually say it, the man who attributed it to him was a mind-reader, because that is his political philosophy—spend and spend, and tax and tax. They got that far, but the people said "No" when it came to "elect and elect." Maybe that is what he was worried about. The spending and taxing went through, but the electing fell considerably short.

Here is what Mr. Kent says about it; and I believe Mr. Kent more than I do Mr. Hopkins. You may believe Mr. Hopkins if you want to. That is your privilege, but I believe Mr. Kent; and here is what he said:

I was first told of the remark in New York by a friend of Mr. Hopkins who is also friend of mine. It was repeated with a good deal of emphasis as part of a conversation that occurred between Mr. Hopkins and this mutual friend in August at one of the New York race tracks.

When he was playing around.

This friend is a man of reputation and standing. It is impossible to conceive of him imagining the remark and he had no conceivable reason for misquoting Mr. Hopkins. It seemed to me to fit perfectly into previous expressions of Mr. Hopkins' political philosophy.

Oh, I know that some of you say, "Why did not this man come to confront Mr. Hopkins with the statement?" That is all right; you may say that, but there is no Member of the Senate who does not know why a man would not come. If he is in business, the best way for him to get out of business would have been to come and prove this statement on Mr. Hopkins, because the administration would check his income-tax immediately—immediately—and I challenge contradiction of my statement on that subject. They would check his income tax, and then they would check and see if he had violated the Wagner Labor Act, and then they would see if he had any stock under the S. E. C., and then, after they had curried him this way and combed him that way, they would say, "All right; it is all right for you to say that Mr. Hopkins made that statement."

If he was in business, he had enough sense not to come forward, because he knew that the very day he came forward to confront Mr. Hopkins with that statement he would be the victim of all kinds of attack from every administration lackey and smear artist that this country knows. If you do not think the administration would do that, I want some of you to try it. I want some of you to try it. I want you to step out in front and watch them take after you.

I do not think there is a person here who does not know why that man did not answer that question and why he did not come forward. You know and I know, and I think it is a terrible condition, that in the United States of America a man cannot make a public statement about the administration without being investigated in a week's time by some of the New Deal agencies. Yes; I think that is terrible. You know it, and I know it is true. No wonder he did not come forward, but I believe what Mr. Kent said is truthful. I believe it is truthful. Maybe Mr. Hopkins said that after he had lost \$2 across the board at the race track. [Laughter.] I do not know, but nevertheless I believe he said it, because he believed in spending, taxing, and electing.

But let me go on to some more of Mr. Hopkins' testimony before the committee. I want to read parts of it:

Senator JOHNSON of California. You said that you assume responsibility for the mistakes they have made.

Mr. HOPKINS. I assume that goes into the question of responsibility. I have never attempted to divest myself from responsibility for the subordinates under me.

Senator JOHNSON of California. Yes. Do you know whether Mr. Williams did make mistakes in the investigations in Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOPKINS. So far as I know, he did not.

In other words, he accepts the statements of his subordinates as being the truth. This repentance is rather belated. Oh, the mourners' bench was there that day! The mourners' bench was there, and Mr. Hopkins went up and became good that particular day before the committee. Oh, he repented for all of the terrible things he had done. Yes; he repented as no man ever repented before. The greatest critic Mr. Hopkins had was Mr. Hopkins himself. But on page 91 they asked him about the Hatch amendment, and he said he

thought it should have been adopted. This is what he said: I want to quote him exactly:

As a matter of fact, I thought it was a great mistake that it did not pass the Senate. I was not consulted at all, at the time that happened. It happened all of a sudden, one afternoon. I think the Hatch amendment should have been passed, and that something like it should be passed.

"It happened all of a sudden, one afternoon," and poor Mr. Hopkins knew nothing about it. I wanted to see if "it happened all of a sudden, one afternoon." I did not know whether my memory was good, and I went back to look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I found that the amendment was debated on June 2. On the next day the News, of this city, printed the names of those who voted for it and those who voted against it, and suggested that it was going to be reconsidered. It was not reconsidered until June 3, the following night, and Mr. Hopkins was silent. Oh, yes, Mr. Hopkins was silent. He was as silent as an oyster on the beach in July. Oh, yes; he was silent, because he did not know about the Hatch amendment. It was not on the "must" list. He knew only those bills on the "must" list. In other words, you must vote for it if you get a project. That is the "must" part of it.

I do not think of any better way to speak of that particular recanting than to quote from the News, of Washington. It closes its editorial with this language:

Harry Hopkins now says that he thinks the Senate made a bad mistake when it voted down the Hatch amendment forbidding politics in relief.

"Well do we remember that hot summer night of sweat and oratory when the Senate got down to the final vote on the Hatch amendment, and when the 'purge committee'—does that word sound familiar to any of the 'purgees'?—when the 'purge committee' was cracking the whip, and the majority of Senators said, 'Me, too,' on the proposition that W. P. A. should be left free to play politics. It must have been the heat, because Mr. Hopkins did not know anything about it; but in the cool reflection of January Mr. Hopkins said he was 'in favor of the Hatch amendment.' Then the editorial closes:

Where, where was Roderick then?
One blast upon his bugle horn
Were worth a thousand men.

[Laughter.]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did Mr. Hopkins again refer to the vote on the Hatch amendment in the hearing before the Commerce Committee?

Mr. HOLT. He referred to it. They asked him the specific question. It is found on page 91 of the hearing.

Mr. GEORGE. Was his attention called to the fact that there were more than two votes taken on the Hatch amendment, or at least more than one vote?

Mr. HOLT. Not to my knowledge. The report of the hearing does not show that they asked him about that further, because he said it happened all of a sudden one afternoon, and he did not know about it.

Mr. GEORGE. Did he rest his answer on that point, upon that bald statement that it happened all of a sudden one afternoon?

Mr. HOLT. I think it is best to read that again. Let me read what he said.

Mr. GEORGE. I am just curious to know whether or not he was willing to deceive the committee.

Mr. HOLT. I wish to read it again, because I think it is important to read it. He said, "Not at all, Senator."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator read the question the chairman asked him?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to read it. This is the record: The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any hand at all in preventing the enactment of that legislation?

Mr. HOPKINS. Not at all, Senator. As a matter of fact, I thought it was a great mistake that it did not pass the Senate. I was not consulted at all, at the time that happened. It happened

all of a sudden, one afternoon. I think the Hatch amendment should have been passed, and something like it should be passed.

There is no other statement in the record by Mr. Hopkins about that.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to interrupt—

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Every Member of the Senate knows that we voted not only upon the Hatch amendment, but voted at least once to reconsider the vote, and I think twice; and the votes did not come on the same date.

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, may I correct the Senator?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I merely desire to correct the Senator. The Hatch amendment came to a vote one day.

Mr. HOLT. Let me interject and say it was on June 2.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Subsequently the Hatch amendment came to another vote, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] made a motion to reconsider. That was 1 day subsequent. In the interim an amendment of similar import, but much stronger, was offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. GEORGE. I very well recall that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And that was defeated, as I recall, by one vote. There was considerable time intervening between the first action, upon the Hatch amendment, and the action on the Austin amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I do not unduly interrupt the Senator from West Virginia—

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia at any time.

Mr. GEORGE. To me it is perfectly remarkable that Mr. Hopkins, a man appointed to a Cabinet position, should have rested his position on the Hatch amendment upon that statement, that it came suddenly one day, when for days the matter was thoroughly agitated in the Senate. I felt at the time, and I feel now, that the defeat of the Hatch amendment and the defeat of the Austin amendment were most regrettable pages in the history of the Democratic Party in this country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the Senator from Georgia. There is not a Senator here who was a Member of the Senate in June last who does not know that every administration "yes" man—and we have them, those who control the W. P. A. patronage in their States—every single individual who could be controlled, voted against the Hatch amendment and voted against the Austin amendment, and every one knows that the whole thing was decided, and that there was a flurry and an actual panic in some places for fear the motion to reconsider would be agreed to.

Did they get busy! Every one here knows they got busy. One could hardly use the telephone that night. I do not know what they were discussing on the telephone—Senators can decide that for themselves—but I know that whenever the administration is cracking the whip, if a Senator goes into the cloakroom to use the telephone, he will soon see how easy it is for him to get one.

Everyone knows that the whip was used. Everyone knows that the projects which Mr. Hopkins himself could stop or could start were to be determined, in a great number of instances, by the vote that one would support or not support the administration.

Yes, it happened "all of a sudden, one afternoon." Oh, would that not make a good title for a song? "It happened all of a sudden, one afternoon." [Laughter.] It has no rhyme or reason, really, but nevertheless it would be a good song to go along with "Flat Foot Floogie" and some of the rest of that particular type. [Laughter.] The country knew about it, the Senate knew about it, everyone knew about it except Mr. Hopkins, but it came on him "all of a sudden, one afternoon," that the Senate was trying to take politics out of relief.

Mr. President, I hope when Mr. Hopkins becomes Secretary of Commerce—and he is going to become Secretary of Commerce, there is no question about it—he will have an administrative assistant, one of the 10,000 they have around Washington, to tell him what is happening up here on Capitol Hill, so that it will not come on him "all of a sudden" one afternoon. I do hope he will become acquainted with what is going on, and that the Hatch amendment, if it is presented again, will not surprise him, that we will not sneak up on him and say, "Here is an amendment."

Of course, Senators can form their own opinions about that, but my decision is already made. I do not believe Mr. Hopkins. I would not say more. I could, but I must confine myself to that particular statement.

Mr. Hopkins helped put politics in relief. Senators may believe otherwise if they care to, but I know, and others here know, that Mr. Hopkins consulted with the patronage bosses of the various States as to whom they wanted as administrators. Of course, if one were on the "purge" list, he was not consulted. Oh, no, he would not consult such a Senator at all, if the Senator were a "purgee." Of course, all the "purgees" are back in the Senate, thanks to the good judgment of the people. If one was a member of the "purgee" band, he was not consulted, so I excuse any in that particular group, but if one voted for all the other "court jester" plans that were sent to Congress he had a right to determine who should run the W. P. A. in his State.

You can imagine that if you wanted a certain project approved and there was an important vote on Capitol Hill, if there was a very important vote in which the administration was interested, and you should call down to Mr. Hopkins' office and say, "Mr. Hopkins, I wish you would see that they approve a certain project," do you think it would be approved? You know it would be approved. There is not a man in the Senate who does not know it would be approved if you wanted to get John Jones or Bill Smith on the pay roll and there was a vote here and you had a good record. If you were not one of these terrible conservatives, or "Tories," or whatever they might be called, that was a good time to call—oh, it was an extremely good time to call—because you would be rewarded, not only by the appointment of that man but, depending on the necessity, by the appointment of as many others as might be necessary.

I shall not discuss the reversal of Mr. Hopkins. I think the greatest indictment of Mr. Hopkins' conduct of the W. P. A. was Mr. Hopkins' own testimony. There cannot be a greater indictment against Mr. Hopkins than Mr. Hopkins himself. It is a confession in itself, but the confession was made just the same as a man throwing himself on the mercy of the judge, saying, "Judge, I did it, but I did not mean it. It just happened to be in my pocket when they caught me."

Oh, it is easy to make those statements, but we all know that the politics put in by Mr. Hopkins was put in by the Democratic Senate. W. P. A. was a good political project until the last election. It is surprising now, it is indeed surprising, to see the attitude toward relief in politics, for back in 1936, when I started to speak of that matter, most of the Democratic Senators could be found in their offices, because they thought that if they should walk out and not say anything about the W. P. A., they would hush the talk and stop it. But the American people have found out the tragedy of the W. P. A., not the tragedy of feeding people, but the tragedy of not feeding people and putting in their places political officeholders.

Oh, these crocodile tears which are being shed about the hungry people we will cut off if we cut the appropriation. Those crocodile tears are not for the poor relief worker; most of them are for some fellow sitting behind a desk.

Mr. President, I want to make this statement public; if the money that was appropriated to feed the hungry had been spent to feed the hungry instead of in trying to purge the Senate, we would have enough money in the Treasury to carry us through. If the money that was spent to purge the Senate of men who, in my opinion, reflect the great intelligence of the Senate, had been spent to feed hungry people

in this country, we would have enough money in the Treasury.

Yes, crocodile tears! You may shed them as you like, but in my State, where they are cutting thousands off the relief roll, how many bosses do you suppose they put out of office? Before the election they had 549 on the administrative staff. On December 15 some poor fellow, who must not have voted right, got cut off, because, I understand, there are now 548. Yes, one was cut off. One poor, unfortunate fellow—and he probably was in the \$780 class; do not be fooled about that—was cut off. I have not checked the class he was in, but I should not be surprised if he was in that class.

Mr. TYDINGS. Perhaps he lost his precinct.

Mr. HOLT. Yes, he probably lost his precinct. I think the Senator's suggestion is right. I expect it will be found that he did not deliver the goods. But we had 549 bosses before the election, and now with the terror of money running short—oh, the money is running awfully short—one boss got the ax, and yet the poor relief fellow for whom the tears are being shed all over the country about him it is being said, "You cannot cut him off because if you do we will have hunger throughout the land." It is indeed a tragedy. And how they love the poor unfortunate relief worker. If they had loved him more when they put bosses on the pay roll their present argument would be more dependable, in my opinion. I say, yes, feed the people, but take out by the seat of their trousers those men who sit behind the desks and do nothing except work at election time. If you do that you will have money for relief. You know and I know that thousands are on the relief rolls of America because they are political workers. I intend to discuss that, and I hope that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] will be here when I do, because I want to discuss his State most thoroughly. [Laughter.]

I will not proceed to go into the question of "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect," because at last the Senate has asserted itself. Senators know it is a little more popular to tell the truth in 1939 than it was in 1936. Oh, it is now a whole lot more popular to tell the truth. If Senators do not think so, let us try it. It will be a good way to determine it. But I should like to discuss at some time, when the W. P. A. appropriation bill is up for consideration in the Senate, the great projects of the W. P. A., the greatest projects that Mr. Hopkins has.

The first project I wish to discuss then is, "If I were in Iowa I should vote for Mr. Wearin." That is the Iowa political project.

Then I would discuss the Georgia project, when Mr. Hopkins became very busy and ran down to Georgia to look about the projects in Georgia, in an effort to defeat, in my opinion, as I say again, one of the most intellectual men who ever sat in the United States Senate, and we need that type at all times.

Then the third one. He went to the State of Maryland. Of course, we all know about the proposal with respect to bridges in Maryland. I do not know whether they built those bridges over in Maryland or not. They were going to build two bridges.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lucas in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to tell my good friend about those bridges. They had determined to give them up, but I prevailed, using my great influence with the administration, and they are now under construction. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Maryland, whom we all like, and whom we all admire, probably was a little more welcome after the election than he was before.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will agree that there is probably no man in the Congress who has as much influence

with the administration as the Senator from Maryland now has. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. On personal grounds, I must object to that statement, because I believe I have particular power with the administration.

This political project in Maryland, the building of the bridges, I shall discuss when the appropriation measure comes up.

Then, I wish to discuss the particular project in the State of California, a project in connection with which Mr. Hopkins just had to dash out there. Senators know he simply could not wait. He had to dash out there before the election to find out if they were building a road up some gulley in California. He found out. I shall discuss that a little later on.

I think the best illustration of Mr. Hopkins' power is shown in November 1936. Of course, 1936 was different from 1938. I think Senators all know that—1936 was quite a little different from 1938. Mr. Hopkins was sitting on the top of the world, because he delivered in 1936, and somebody delivered him in 1938—that was the difference. [Laughter.]

In 1936, here is what was said by an administration propagandist. Here is the exact language:

And Mr. Hopkins is, politically speaking, sitting on top of the world—

I knew he was sitting some place, and I wager he was on the Government pay roll, because he has been on it most of the time.

And Mr. Hopkins is, politically speaking, sitting on top of the world and able to write his own ticket—

That must be straight across the board. [Laughter.]

If the relief workers hold the political balance of power in American elections, and Hopkins is paymaster of relief.

Now, that is just as true a statement as ever was made—

If the relief workers hold the political balance of power in American elections, and Hopkins is paymaster of relief.

That was in 1936. I am quoting from the Des Moines Register of November 1936, the State concerning which Hopkins said, "If I were in Iowa I would vote for Wearin."

I shall not discuss that any more, except to say that there is not a Democrat on this side of the aisle who does not know the part that Mr. Hopkins played in the purges. I do not know what title they gave him. But you know and I know that Mr. Hopkins was a member of the purge committee, with Tommy Corcoran, who loves to play the accordion. I do not know whether Mr. Hopkins sings or not, but they have a nice time together, all at the expense of the people. Nevertheless, this purge committee, not one of whose members was ever elected to office to my knowledge; no, not one of them, but they are all on the "take-in" end, being paid by someone—that purge committee met in the palace, with the court jesters, and all the kingly characters that went along with it, and started out and said "The Senator from Iowa should bite the dust first." He was selected.

Of course, some of the rest of us got it a little earlier, but we were not up for election at that time. Nevertheless, the Senator from Iowa was to bite the dust. He was to be taken out. Then they would go down to South Carolina and defeat that terrible man from South Carolina—they said he was terrible—the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], but the people of South Carolina felt just as I felt, that they were ably and well represented by a great and distinguished Senator in Senator SMITH. So the purge committee took a shot at him.

Then he went down to Warm Springs, Ga., to defeat the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Of course, he wanted to look at a project down there. Do not get me wrong. He just went down to look over a project of some particular nature. I just do not know what it was. I would like for Mr. Hopkins to tell me what projects he was inspecting down there. I know he was not trying to trace the history of the safety pin, or count the doors in the Minneapolis city hall, or count the number of trees in Cleveland, but nevertheless he had a project down there of some nature at just the particular time that the purge was being made, and you know and I know

that the Senators were to be driven from office because they would not take orders, and that W. P. A. was the instrument by which they were to be defeated. I say that openly, I say it frankly, that W. P. A. was to be used, with Mr. Hopkins' consent, to try to beat the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and all other Senators that would not agree with the administration and vote "yes" when they were told to vote "yes."

Senators remember when they put the heat on the Senate. They put it on quite often here. Senators remember when they put the heat on in the Supreme Court battle. One of the instances of putting the heat on during the Supreme Court battle was a radio speech by Mr. Harry L. Hopkins on the Supreme Court. He told the unfortunate, needy, relief workers that they were going to starve to death unless they backed the court change. There is no doubt about that. He spoke of those "old men" standing in the way of food for the needy. I need not give Senators that information. It is in the hearings. I wish Senators to read Mr. Hopkins' speech on the Supreme Court plan. There Senators will find Mr. Hopkins taking a part in the Supreme Court battle, and putting on the heat, so that the various Senators were supposedly to get in line behind the Supreme Court change.

I know some will say, "Oh, Mr. Hopkins has said time and time again that no man shall be fired if he votes as he pleases"; that "W. P. A. had no part in politics." They would take that ground because he sent out a letter to that effect. He would send a letter, and then the boss would tell the workers, "All right; but you and I know what it means. It is nice to put it out before the public, but you know and I know that it means vote as we tell you." Think of the hypocrisy behind the idea, the political hypocrisy of Mr. Hopkins saying he was taking no part.

Senators will recall very distinctly a speech made by President Roosevelt in Madison Square Garden in 1936, when he criticized those who would put slips in pay envelopes threatening people with loss of their jobs if they did not vote a certain way. I, too, condemned that. I think it was wrong. I think it was a form of economic coercion. But what are we doing? We are exercising a governmental economic coercion on poor, unfortunate men who are hungry, and whose families are hungry, in America, in order that the bright day may come to America, that the happier life, the "more abundant life," may come.

Mr. Hopkins has said, "I am against politics in relief." Some time in the near future, when Mr. Hopkins is sitting down there in the Department of Commerce building—which was called Hoover's folly, and which is now overrun with Government employees—I wish Mr. Hopkins would send to the Senate the list of persons whom he has fired from the W. P. A. for playing politics. It would not take long to read that list. It could be read very, very quickly. We have heard much about such persons being fired. Down in Kentucky they did not fire them. They just slapped them on the wrist after they had done their work, and said, "You have been a good man, but don't do it again."

So it is that the denial of relief in politics has developed. Of course, Mr. Hopkins controlled his own investigation. This is what happened: Some Senator made a complaint about W. P. A., as I did. I have made plenty of such complaints, and I intend to make plenty more.

When a Senator made a complaint about politics in the W. P. A. Mr. Hopkins named an investigator to go to the Senator's State and find out about it. As I once said, he sent out those investigators to investigate themselves. I once said on the floor of the Senate—and I wish to repeat it—that sending a W. P. A. investigator to investigate the W. P. A. was like sending Baby Face Nelson to investigate Dillinger. I said that in 1936, and I say it again. Those investigators never found anything. Where and when has a W. P. A. investigator ever found that there was politics in relief? I know from my own knowledge that in one instance investigators were told not to look into the facts presented but to obtain facts on the man who made the complaint. That is the type of investigation which Mr. Hopkins has con-

ducted. Thousands of dollars have been spent by the W. P. A. to obtain evidence on Members of Congress who would not go along. He has spent much on that activity.

I should like to refer for just a moment to Kentucky. I shall not spend much time on that question; but, according to Mr. Hopkins, there was not any politics in relief in Kentucky. After enumerating every one of the 22 charges made by Tom Stokes, which charges the committee discussed at length, Mr. Hopkins was satisfied. He said:

There you have the record on every specific charge made in this series of articles. Against the unsupported statements of the reporter and the affidavits of disgruntled workers and party workers stands the documented evidence and the sworn testimony disproving every important accusation.

This is Mr. Hopkins talking about Kentucky:

General charges of political favoritism by W. P. A. officials have been based upon these specific cases. They have no more validity than the specific cases upon which they depend for support, and a thorough investigation, as fully set forth above, has swept away their foundation in fact.

A thorough investigation would prove that there was not any politics in the W. P. A. in Kentucky. This is Mr. Hopkins speaking, and I want to be sure to quote him correctly:

I recognize that in a far-flung organization covering the 3,300 counties in America, with 64,000 projects and 2,700,000 workers, there will occur indiscretions by overzealous partisans in the midst of heated campaigns, but that is a vastly different thing from a planned and organized political campaign on the part of the responsible heads of any Government agency.

I wish to digress long enough to ask, What does Mr. Hopkins think of the purge? I shall discuss that subject a little later, and I shall read his speech in Boston on the purge. He was in favor of the purge, and yet here he flipped again. He is the daring young man on the flying trapeze, who flies through the air with the greatest of ease. He flies to one trapeze, and when it becomes too hot he flies to another.

Proceeding with Mr. Hopkins' denial of politics in relief in Kentucky, he said:

I am mindful of the fact that in political campaigns newspapers and others have a tendency to make loose and unsupported charges involving the integrity of the political party they oppose. In the heat of a campaign partisans on occasion give out misleading and inaccurate information. This seems to be inherent in our political system. While I know that this series of articles was based on inaccurate information, I am quite aware of the fact, nevertheless, that other similar misleading and inaccurate statements may be made before the coming elections are over. I do not intend to permit charges against W. P. A. officials and employees, in whose integrity I have confidence, to go unanswered, and I intend to use every instrument at my command to acquaint the American people with the truth or falsity of such charges.

When, oh when, has Mr. Hopkins ever acquainted the people with the truth about politics in relief? Never to my knowledge. I invite any Senator present to show instances in which Mr. Hopkins has taken the ax, except to pat his workers on the back. He might have said, "Do not do it again, boys. At least, do not do it openly. Be careful, and do not get caught the next time." Nevertheless, such things were done.

Back in 1938, when the relief appropriation bill was before us, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] asked Mr. Hopkins whether there was any politics in relief. The Senator said:

That is especially true in Pennsylvania right now, where a lot of charges are being made.

I shall read Mr. Hopkins' answer about politics in Pennsylvania. When I talk about politics in Pennsylvania I have to hold my nose. However, this is what Mr. Hopkins said:

Well, I think the best answer to that is that it is simply not true.

That was Mr. Hopkins in 1938 saying that there was no politics in relief in Pennsylvania. The charge was "simply not true."

Of course, I realize that Mr. Hopkins is a little obstinate, a little bull-headed. This morning, for the first time, I found that he has a good namesake. According to a story appearing in the New York Post of January 7, 1939, one of the mules in Warm Springs, Ga., is known as "Hop." Nevertheless, I shall not discuss that point.

I wish to go a little further into the question whether or not Mr. Hopkins played politics in relief and the speeches which he made to play politics in relief. The New York Times of October 20, 1936, quotes the language of Mr. Hopkins. Of course, the New York Times also quoted him to the effect that "We will spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect," but he has denied that. The New York Times quoted Mr. Hopkins' speech at a campaign gathering. He merely wanted to have the W. P. A. get along nicely. This is what he said:

It is always thus. The politics is always in some other city than your own. The bad projects are always in some other city, too.

Then he asked the people in New York City in 1936 to vote for the Democratic ticket. No; that did not mean politics at all. He knew that they would do it anyway. He said 90 percent of them would do so.

I should like to talk again about the purge. I should not talk about that, because it brings sad memories to many Members of this body, not that it was successful, because it was not successful. The purge died the death of many such things.

I have before me a photostatic copy of an article from the New York Times of Wednesday, August 31, 1938. The headline is:

Roosevelt purge upheld by Hopkins. He attacks those who wore "our insignia" at polls, then flouted ideals. Role of Tories assailed.

Can you not see Mr. Hopkins assailing the Tories?

Foes are active in primaries, W. P. A. chief tells Democratic women in Boston.

He is not in politics. Do not accuse Mr. Hopkins of being in politics.

Boston, August 30—

Perhaps Mr. Hopkins forgot this. I do not know. He forgets very easily. He has a most remarkable memory.

Boston, August 30.—Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the W. P. A., went to the defense of the governmental agency he directs and still more vehemently to the justification of President Roosevelt's "purge" program in an address before Democratic women assembled tonight from 10 northeastern States. He was the main speaker at the main event of the 2-day conference held under the auspices of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the date of that article?

Mr. HOLT. August 30.

Mr. TYDINGS. 1938?

Mr. HOLT. 1938.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just before the primary?

Mr. HOLT. That was before the primary. Of course, Mr. Hopkins did not take any part in politics. He was going to slap the fellows who took part in politics.

I do not think there is any humor in what Mr. Hopkins told the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Let me read what he said. He believed the purge was all right. Why? Because those who were to be purged voted their convictions, and did not take orders from Harry Hopkins. That is why they were to be purged. They would not take orders from him. They would not sell their votes for a few projects.

Let me continue with the reading:

To the enthusiastic applause of men and women of the party, he attacked the opponents of the administration before both a local and radio audience as "witch burners" who have forfeited political integrity to wreak destruction upon the Democrats.

I am sorry the Senator from Maryland is a witch burner, but he must have been, because I am sure Harry Hopkins would tell the truth.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been called so many things in the past 6 or 8 months that I am inclined to look upon the name "witch burner," coming from that source, as a compliment.

Mr. HOLT. I do not know whether he is a witch burner, but he has burned them up in Maryland, I will say.

Mr. Hopkins said:

As "witch burners" who have forfeited political integrity to wreak destruction upon the Democrats.

"The object of political campaigns is to win elections," he asserted.

"It was therefore inevitable that the conflict between the administration and the Tories would shift at least partially to a few of the primaries within the Democratic Party.

"This is not just a piece of logic. It is an accomplished fact. The leadership of the opposition is right now putting its full strength in men and money behind candidates in half a dozen States who have been most hostile to the things for which this administration stands.

ASSAILS OWN PARTY MEMBERS

"The leadership of the opposition," Mr. Hopkins went on, "is today urging people who never had any desire to enter a Democratic primary before, and have no desire to do so now, to register and help defeat the aims of President Roosevelt, not in clear-cut general election where the divergent views of parties are clearly understood by the voters, but stealthily within the councils of our own party."

That is Mr. Hopkins speaking. Let the Senate understand that. In other words, he said that they were doing a terrible thing. How many times, Mr. President, have you and I heard the leader of our party on this side ask the Republicans to come over and vote with the Democrats? We are all the same people except that we are "tweedledee" Democrats and you are "tweedledum" Republicans.

I quote further from Mr. Hopkins:

The effect of this is that there is no general opposition party which stands on its own feet under its own banner and advocates its own principles. The opposition has given up its identity, and even its integrity, for a better chance to win.

In 1936 the course was crystal clear. Everybody knew which way we were going.

I am glad somebody knew, because we have not got there yet. Nevertheless, he said everybody knew where we were going. The country went some place in 1937 and 1938 but they are having a hard time finding where it went. Nevertheless, he said everybody knew which way we were going.

Everybody had had 4 years to make up his mind.

It did not happen all of a sudden one afternoon, but they had 4 years to make up their minds—

Everybody had had 4 years to make up his mind, yet there were men who did not believe in these things and who tricked the voters by wearing our insignia, only to turn against us as soon as they got into office.

They fought wages and hours. They fought relief for the unemployed. They fought social security. They fought agricultural legislation.

They fought the very heart of the program which the Democratic Party has pledged to the American people that it will carry out.

There was another pledge we made, I remember, in 1932, and I also remember the headline in the New York Times of Thursday after the election, "President Roosevelt dashes back to Washington to balance the Budget." That was in 1936. In 1932 there was another pledge made to reduce expenditures 25 percent. However, I need not bring these matters up now, for I wish to discuss them a little later on.

I quote further from Mr. Hopkins:

SAYS PRESIDENT CLEARS CONFUSION

"Even while they hacked away at the foundation of our program with one hand they were patting the President on the back with the other, protesting to the voters that they were really good Democrats," the speaker continued; "that they were really with us in the broader sense, pleading that they were merely exercising independent judgment.

"Under those circumstances, what would you expect the President, as the leader and spokesman of his party, to do?

"He is calling the attention of the voters to the records of these men. He is merely saying: 'These men who came into office with the administration no longer support the administration. If you believe in the administration and want to help it, do not send these men back. If you oppose the administration, these are your men.'

"After that the voters will vote exactly as they want to.

"To say that this is not democracy is an insult to the voters, not to the President.

"The course he has taken is really a step in the direction of responsible government. He is clearing away the cobwebs and the confusion and making the issue plain before the voters who must pass upon it.

"I know the President," Mr. Hopkins resumed.

Yes, Mr. Hopkins knows the President well.

Neither abuse nor flattery, neither pressure nor ridicule, will sway him from the path he and his party have made with the American people. Adulation has not made him arrogant; defeat has not made him timid.

DEFENDS W. P. A.'S ATTITUDE

What we have to decide is whether to go back or go ahead; whether to wink at social and economic injustice or to correct it; whether we want prosperity and profits for a few or prosperity for us all—

"Prosperity for us all." I may say that he will have prosperity; he will have at least 2 more years of prosperity at \$15,000 a year; there is no question about that; that will be the greatest prosperity that Mr. Hopkins ever had or ever will have, for that matter; but there is no question that he used the correct pronoun when he said "prosperity for us all"—

whether we want weasel words or leadership.

Whether, in short, we want to abdicate the stronghold of democracy or to fight for it. And I think we, too, have "only just begun to fight."

And I think we, too, have only just begun to fight.

Then he says, right after making that speech—and this is very interesting—

In defense of the political purity—

"Political purity!" I want the Senate to appreciate that. That is his exact language:

In defense of the "political purity" of the W. P. A., Mr. Hopkins declared he was only reiterating his former assertions of the real situation in his declaration that no pressure was being brought to bear on its beneficiaries.

"No one is fired from the W. P. A. for the way he votes," he proclaimed. "I have stated our position so many times that you must know it by heart. No one need be a Democrat to get work from the W. P. A. The W. P. A. will not tolerate political activity within its ranks."

Think of that! After making a speech saying, "You know who was putting you in here; you know who was responsible for it; I think our opponents ought to be defeated," he says, "but I do not mean to tell you how to vote; I am just telling you that; do not pay any attention to it, just listen to it and then forget about it." Then he says:

"W. P. A. workers are free men and women, however, who are just as much entitled to their own opinions as any other American citizens, and they do not dwell in a vacuum; they are just as subject to influences and solicitation outside the W. P. A. as anyone else."

"But within, this organization is as clean as honest, earnest effort can have it, and I have not the slightest apology for it."

Every administration in this country's history, Mr. Hopkins said, has "seen fit to take its case to the people."

In other words, in one breath, he says—

Elect the men who vote with us; they are the great men of the country; they are the men who will feed you, the men who will insure good prices for the agricultural regions; they are the men who will put you on the W. P. A. The other fellows are merely "witch burners"; they want to destroy all these reforms; but do not think I mean anything by way of politics at all. I am just saying these things.

The Senate can determine whether or not Mr. Hopkins meant that message to go to every relief boss in the State of Massachusetts and every other boss in the New England States where it was made. In one breath, he was talking politics and in the next breath prating of "political purity"—"political purity!" Mr. President, have you ever heard a more ridiculous statement than that when he talks about the W. P. A. he has in mind "political purity?" Of course, Mr. Hopkins' attitude is one of political piety. That is the only difference, and he knows it. Mr. Hopkins helped put politics in the W. P. A., as I said a moment ago, and there is not a Democrat on this side of the aisle who does not know it and know it well. Every Democrat knows that the W. P. A. was behind the organization, that is if the organization was not supporting Democrats to be purged. Of course if they were to be purged they would not be consulted. I understand that is to be the case; that "the powers that be" are going to consult only those who do not put any politics in W. P. A. Let the boss determine it. But let me go ahead with these statements. I wish to

recur to a statement to which I referred a moment ago. I want again to read it and put it in the RECORD. It is a speech made at New Ulm, Minn., where Mr. Hopkins went just to look after W. P. A. projects in Minnesota. However, he had time to make a speech at New Ulm on the 13th day of September, and I want to quote from the Associated Press again as to what Mr. Hopkins said.

Harry Hopkins, Federal Works Progress Administration chieftain, toured local W. P. A. projects today after declaring—

This is Mr. Hopkins speaking—

it is "perfectly proper in a democracy for relief to become a political issue."

Think of that! In one breath he says there is no politics in relief; then he goes to Minnesota, and when he did not know there was a reporter present and when he was touring W. P. A. projects—and he has never denied the statement, although I expect him to do so tomorrow; I presume it just happened that his memory does not serve him right in this connection—and at New Ulm, Minn., according to the Associated Press, he said:

It is perfectly proper in a democracy for relief to become a political issue.

Furthermore—

Addressing 100 civic officials and businessmen last night—

He must have been thinking about the office of Secretary of Commerce, for there were businessmen there. So I am sure Mr. Hopkins must have been thinking about that—

Addressing 100 civic officials and businessmen last night, Mr. Hopkins said, "There is nothing wrong in supporting the political group that will give you the most."

I will read that again. This is what the committee raised such a howl about Aubrey Williams saying, but here is Mr. Hopkins directly quoted in Minnesota saying:

There is nothing wrong in supporting the political group that will give you the most.

Oh, no; there is no politics in relief at all; "just support the fellows who give you the most; and we give you the most." In other words, "Put seats in the United States Senate, put seats in the House of Representatives of the United States, put governorships on the auction block, and sell them to the man who will give you the most." No wonder the country is in a bad condition; no wonder business is stagnating. How can we have recovery when we have a system of government that says that offices shall be given to those who give you the most? That is the quotation from the Associated Press.

Then, Mr. Hopkins goes further and says:

Relief is a good issue and should be debated.

That is what I am trying to do here.

The public is demanding more and more service from this Government and should elect candidates who will give it to them.

I will repeat that: "No politics in relief," yet this is Mr. Hopkins speaking. He probably spoke "off the cuff"; but, nevertheless, here is what he said:

Relief is a good issue, and should be debated. The public is demanding more and more service from its Government, and should elect candidates who will give it to them.

Oh, no—no politics in relief at all; none whatsoever!

Then he says: "Boys, don't pay any attention to that. I was just talking to businessmen. I want to become Secretary of Commerce."

Then Mr. Hopkins went out to South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, where he talked to Jerry O'Connell. Some of you were not in the Chamber when I told you about that trip out to Montana, where he did not talk to Senator BURTON WHEELER. I thought he knew Senator WHEELER pretty well. Senator WHEELER has been up here on the hill a long while, but it is a funny thing that Mr. Hopkins went through Montana, and Jerry O'Connell was there. Well, Jerry has been in a number of places that I know of.

Nevertheless, you know, Jerry was being groomed as the boy to take Senator WHEELER's place in the Senate because Senator WHEELER would not take orders. So Mr. Hopkins just stopped, you know. There was a project up Jerry

O'Connell's back alley that Jerry wanted to talk about, and it may have been that the sidewalk in front of Jerry's house needed to be paved as a W. P. A. project, so Mr. Hopkins decided to talk to Jerry on the train as he went through Montana; and he talked to Frank Walker's brother, who was a candidate for judge; and this other poor fellow he did not know so well. He was just a candidate for sheriff. Mr. Hopkins did not know who he was, but he knew he got on the train, and Mr. Hopkins talked to him, but he did not say what they talked about; but I would not want any of you to infer that I thought Mr. Hopkins talked about politics. You know he would not do that, because he is against politics in relief. He says so. But, anyway, he went on through Montana. Did I tell you the result of the election out there? You know it. Just look in your Congressional Directory and see what happened to Jerry.

Nevertheless, Mr. Hopkins went on through Montana and went on out to Washington, and took nearly as extensive a trip as that taken recently by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], whom I see in the Chamber, though Mr. Hopkins did not go up to Alaska. Nevertheless, after he went up to Washington he went down to California; and, according to the Los Angeles Times of November 3, 1938, he did not go out there for politics. He told the committee he just went out there to see about some projects. He had to go out there just the week before election. This is what the article in the Los Angeles Times says:

W. P. A. chief extols party. Hopkins recommends vote for Democrats in radio address.

No; he did not mean anything about politics. This is dated November 3. Do not get me wrong. Mr. Hopkins does not believe in politics in relief—not at all—but on November 3, 1938, he made this radio address, and I do not know of any election since that time. Maybe some of the rest of you do, but I do not. But the Los Angeles Times of November 3, 1938, said what I am about to read. Of course, Mr. Hopkins did not go out there in connection with politics, but here is what the article says:

Hopkins, who slipped quietly into Los Angeles and attended a Hollywood ice carnival Tuesday with Mrs. John Hay Whitney, defended President Roosevelt and enumerated many of his policies in his radio address. He was a guest at the Beverly Hills Hotel.

But let me read you the article about his political speech out there. I am not saying anything about the candidates in California. I am just showing you what Mr. Hopkins did, and you can determine whether or not there is any politics about it.

Urging the election of Democratic candidates in next Tuesday's voting, Harry L. Hopkins, National Works Progress Administrator, last night delivered a radio address here under the auspices of the California Volunteers, an Olson-for-Governor campaign group.

Here is a quotation from Mr. Hopkins:

"For my part," said Hopkins, "I am convinced that Olson, Patterson, Downey and the Congressmen running on the Democratic ticket will give to the people of this State a more effective representation in assuring the continuance and expansion of our Democratic processes.

Then the next heading of this article is:

Sees opportunity.

There is no question about that. The article says, "Sees opportunity," and here is what it goes on to say, quoting Mr. Hopkins again:

In the last analysis this means that every man, woman and child in America shall have the opportunity for a way of life that is typically American.

You find in this State two sets of men pleading for your vote. On one hand, those who believe government has no power and no place in the economic scheme to influence favorably a way of life, who believe that interest rates to home owners and farmers and prices of farm products should find their own economic level.

That is the sort of thing that he said there. I wonder if that is "no politics in relief" that he is thinking about.

Masked under a cloak of fine phrases, these candidates are men whose record and history can put them down only as men who have not only failed to take one affirmative step in the interest of labor, but, indeed, might well be classified as persons who would destroy the very dignity of labor itself.

Now, get this clear: This is Mr. Hopkins speaking in Los Angeles on the subject No Politics in Relief. I am sure he spoke on that subject, because here he is going ahead:

On the other hand you have candidates on the Democratic ticket whose backgrounds in political life have been schooled and developed in an environment leading to convictions that a better way of living could be found for all people.

I say that is "the more abundant life" that we have heard so much about; but he does not use that term. But going back to Mr. Hopkins again, the next heading in this story is:

CHOICE OUTLINED

I have found these men vitally concerned with the way businessmen shall make adequate profits who believe that the basis of our economic system is found in giving every reasonable assurance and opportunity for persons who employ labor or buy and sell goods to make a decent profit.

Real personal liberty, not controlled by vigilantes and self-constituted police forces, but by a government determined to represent all the people fairly, is the choice of the voters of this State.

That is the end of Mr. Hopkins' speech on the subject "No politics in relief, but vote for the Democratic ticket on the side"; and so it is. Now, as I said, you may believe, if you want to, that Mr. Hopkins knew nothing about politics in relief. I do not believe it. I know he knows about it.

Then there is another thing: It is funny that this pamphlet just happened to arrive on the third day of November 1938, through the mails. It is postmarked November 3. It was sent to me for some reason; I do not know why, but it was sent. I do not get very much literature any more. I used to. I used to get plenty of literature on "the American way of living" and "the more abundant life," and how to cut 25 percent off the cost of running the Government, and many subjects; but I do not get those things any more. I did get this pamphlet, however. It is from the Works Progress Administration, and it is entitled: "What is the American Way?" by Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the Works Progress Administration. It was just a coincidence—a most peculiar coincidence. The pamphlet was printed by W. P. A. funds and paid for by the Government; but Mr. Hopkins wanted to tell the people what the American way is, and he wanted to see that they knew the American way before the election in November, because I got this pamphlet on the third day of November 1938, as did a number of other persons in the United States. So it was important that the American way should be impressed upon all the voters just a week before election.

It was just a coincidence that that happened. Mr. Hopkins does not believe in politics in relief at all. You all know that he does not. He just sent that pamphlet to me a week before the election so that I could think about it some time later next year. [Laughter.] You can believe that, I say again, if you want to, but I know what he did it for, and you know what he did it for.

In my opinion, what I am about to read is one of the greatest indictments against a public official that I know of. It is from the newspaper of November 27. This is important, because it shows what is done to Members of the Senate and House. I am not worried. They do not have any of my conversations down there—not at all—but this is what the article says:

W. P. A. investigation: There is an excellent though secret reason why the chances are strong Harry Hopkins, W. P. A., will not be subjected to congressional investigation. Reason is that W. P. A. has a record of every telephone conversation with every Congressman—

So I am giving you notice now that you had better watch yourselves; you had better be careful, if you have not seen this article. [Laughter.]

Reason is that W. P. A. has a record of every telephone conversation with every Congressman, including every time they wanted W. P. A. to do a little "politicking"—

I thought there was not any politics down there. Why did they keep a record of the conversations? I am sure this column is not against the administration. Do not be fooled about that. It is for the administration. Nevertheless, the article continues—

Every time they wanted W. P. A. to do a little "politicking" or to cut a corner for the benefit of that particular solon.

In other words, if you call them up and ask them about a project, they have you on record down there. You had better not vote wrong, or they might bring it up on you for some reason. Is it not fine that that sort of thing can happen in an American democracy, and there is "no politics in relief"? Yet if you wanted a project, or wanted a little "politicking" done, they kept a record of the conversation. The best way to do now is to tell them to come on up here and talk to you; but the article goes ahead and says:

A W. P. A. stenographer listened in on every conversation, and the record of congressional requests certainly makes juicy reading.

[Laughter.]

I think that record ought to be published. You know, the W. P. A. publish guides, and they publish histories, and they publish everything that can be published. They have the history of the polar bear, I think, in one of their publications, if you go to the Zoo. Nevertheless, with all these publications, I should like to see published the record that they have down there of telephone conversations with Members of the Senate. That would be most interesting. I am sure it would.

Do not think that was done merely with telephone requests. They wanted the Congressman to understand this:

Note: Congressional mail requests which Hopkins carefully has preserved—

Now, listen:

Congressional mail requests which Hopkins carefully has preserved also would be enough to empty a lot of seats in Congress.

[Laughter.]

You may turn in your resignations if you want to; but, nevertheless, that is what has been going on. Why did Mr. Hopkins take a record of your conversation if you were one of those who called him? I did not call him. I have called him plenty of things, but not on the telephone [laughter]; and I am going to call him a good many more things before the session is over, too. Do not be fooled about that.

While we are talking of calling Mr. Hopkins up, why is it that they make a record of your conversations? If you write him a letter, they have a copy of that letter, and you cannot afford to say anything about it because, if you do, Mr. Hopkins will tell on you. Is not that a nice situation in government? I do not see any particular reason why you should not have a conversation. Perhaps Mr. Hopkins had a conversation recorded in which he said, "we can spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect."

Of course, it might be suggested that one put in an anonymous telephone call. But many people when they are complaining about relief are afraid to say anything about it because they are afraid they will be punished. There is not a Senator on the floor here today who does not have at least one or more letters from someone complaining about relief, someone who was afraid to sign his name because of the fear of punishment. Many American people are afraid to say anything because they know that every time they do say anything they will be punished.

I have brought along a few such letters, and I want to show Senators the feeling of fear the American people have in regard to complaining about W. P. A. Here is one letter:

I am not signing my name to this letter. If you regard this as anything, and for my protection, you may type this and destroy my handwriting. Otherwise I would not care, but I am a W. P. A. worker, and I realize what it would mean to me and my family if I signed my name and one of the gang mentioned herein saw it.

Is not that a nice condition, that citizens of the United States are afraid to sign their names because they are afraid the Federal Government will punish them? What is worse today in Germany than that?

Let us look at a few more of these letters. Here is another one:

I am afraid to sign my name as I have been dealt heavy enough blows.

Here is another afraid to sign his name because he knows "they will boycott me if my name is known."

These things are happening in America. Here is another one. The writer asked me to investigate this. He says:

We can't come out openly as we work on the W. P. A. and don't want to lose our job, as we have been told that there are no other jobs to get.

Here is another one:

This is the first anonymous letter I have ever written, but if my name gets out, out I go.

He knew so well what would happen. He knew, just as you and I know, that if they got his name as complaining, out he would go.

Here is another one:

As I do not relish the idea of being drawn into this political mess, I will not sign this letter.

Here is another one. He speaks about the administrator calling him in, and says:

He called a private meeting of all employees, having a general discussion; all employees were told if they discussed anything that was said to anybody they would be fired at once. Everything was to be strictly confidential among the employees. We were under strict orders to make no discussions whatever about anything that was talked in this private meeting of the office force of the W. P. A. Keep mum or get fired. I am very poor and need to work and will not sign my name.

Such letters as that in America!

Here is another one:

The political intrigue is so great here that I do not desire my name be made public under penalty of losing my job with them, and it is a desire to see justice done that I write you.

Now I quote another letter. I could quote hundreds of them.

For fear of losing my job maybe I had better not sign my name. But if you investigate you will find every statement is true.

He has taken ink and run it through his name so that I cannot find who it is. In other words, after he had written these things he was afraid to sign his name—in America!

Here is another one:

I am not signing my name for I know my business would be destroyed by their low-down methods, but I can say this much to you, my reputation has never been challenged.

Here is another one. I have four or five more to read. I want to put these into the Record to show what is happening in America, people afraid to sign their names because they know that they would lose their W. P. A. jobs, their families go hungry, their business be destroyed, if they dared to sign their names. Then think of people coming here and defending it!

The next letter starts:

It is not my custom to write letters without a proper signature to them but in this instance it is worth my existence to do so, therefore am not doing so, as I need to earn a living and have to hold to what I have to do so.

So he did not sign his name.

Here is another one I should like to read to the Senate:

I will not sign my name, as I have a business and might get into trouble, but just put this on file.

Here is one from my State which I desire to read—all this in America, honest citizens, poor, unfortunate men without jobs, working on the W. P. A., afraid to write a letter to a Senator because they know that if the letters get into the hands of the W. P. A. boss, off the roll they go, on some sort of an excuse. This is the letter:

You may think that one who writes letters without signing them is a coward and that is true in this case, for I am afraid that if I would tell all I know and then you should fail in your attempt to sterilize the W. P. A. set-up in our State, I would be immediately dropped from the rolls and my dependents would suffer.

That in a democracy, people afraid to sign their names for fear of punishment.

Here is the last one. I could go ahead all afternoon, but I wanted the Senate to hear these letters. This is the statement in the last one:

I am not giving my name, for I have a relative or so on the W. P. A. pay rolls, and I know that they would be summarily cut off, and they, needing the job, had rather pay the demanded percentage.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I regret that I entered the Chamber a little late, but I heard the Senator mentioning Germany. Is the Senator reading from German records or American records?

Mr. HOLT. I am reading from letters which have been received by me through the United States mail giving me information about W. P. A., in which W. P. A. employees indicated they were afraid to sign their names for fear of punishment—in America, under the guidance of Harry L. Hopkins, whom they are now trying to make the greatest Secretary of Commerce since I do not know when. [Laughter.] Nevertheless, that is happening in America, and Senator after Senator could follow me on the floor and tell of anonymous letters he has received. But you know and I know that the very fear not only of punishment to themselves but of their children's starving through their being put off the rolls is indeed a great influence.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not mean to leave the impression that the writers of these anonymous letters to him were afraid that he would turn their names over to Mr. Hopkins if they signed the letters, thereby resulting in their punishment? He does not mean to leave that impression?

Mr. HOLT. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not have done that, would he?

Mr. HOLT. I would not have turned over anything to Mr. Hopkins, because I would not trust him with anything. [Laughter.] But I know, and the Senator from Kentucky well knows, that men who did not go along in Kentucky lost their jobs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I know no such thing.

Mr. HOLT. I intend to discuss the Kentucky situation in full, not this afternoon, but later on.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; I welcome that sort of discussion. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that I think I know more about the Kentucky campaign, in which I participated, than he does.

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress adjourned on the 16th of June. I immediately began my active campaign in Kentucky, and from that until the 6th day of August I made an average of over 6 speeches a day, covering 117 out of the 120 counties. In every speech I made, to audiences which assembled to do me honor with their presence, I not only insisted but urged that every W. P. A. employee, every Federal employee, every State employee, and every other public employee, not only had the right to vote as he pleased, but ought to exercise that right. I announced publicly that if anyone would come to me and convince me that any Federal employee or officer or agent had exercised or attempted to exercise coercion or intimidation or force in any way to bring about a vote in my behalf or a contribution in my behalf, I would do my level best to have such person discharged from any such public employment; and from that day until now no one has ever responded to that invitation, which I extended in the utmost sincerity for a period of 6 weeks. So I do not know of any such instances as those referred to by the Senator.

Mr. HOLT. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky a question in my time. Does he mean to tell the Senate that there was no politics in relief in Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not mean to tell the Senate that. I have never insisted that there was no politics in Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. Who put the politics in relief in Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not put it in, and I do not think Mr. Harry Hopkins put it in. There was politics, but it was very largely down in the counties where there were contests carried on among certain officers who had the control of the appointment of the certifying agents in those counties, and

which was not controlled by the W. P. A. As the Senator knows, the W. P. A. does not employ or compensate or appoint the local certifying agents in any county. Those agents are appointed by the county officers. In my State it happens to be by the county judges, and fiscal courts, and they are responsible to the county judges for their appointments and for their compensation.

There were instances perhaps in some counties where county officers and county agents, certifying agents, went beyond the bounds of propriety, locally, in the matter of politics. I did not instigate that. I not only did not instigate it, I condemned it then, as I condemn it now. And Mr. Hopkins knew nothing about that and had nothing to do with it, and it is not fair either to Mr. Hopkins or to me for the Senator, in his own time or anybody else's time, to assert that I knew that there was politics in relief in Kentucky, or that I had anything to do with it.

Mr. HOLT. Let me ask the Senator another question. I am glad that he has joined Mr. Hopkins in politics in relief.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not joined Mr. Hopkins or anybody else. I am merely stating the facts. I have been in public life for more than 30 years. I have never in any way sought to buy a vote, or authorized anyone to buy a vote, or consented to anyone's buying a vote in my behalf. I have never in any political race I have made undertaken to intimidate or to coerce or to force anyone to vote for me. It has never been my policy to do anything like that, and I do not want anyone in the Senate of the United States to intimate that I have. I do not want the reputation which I have built up during 30 years to be shattered by such an imputation on the part of the Senator or anybody else.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator spoke about politics in relief. Can the Senator give the Senate the name of any individual or individuals who were dismissed for playing politics in relief?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot. I am not personally acquainted with them. I do not know anything about them. I knew nothing about what the Senate committee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] reported until 3 months after the primary election was held in Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. It is most interesting. The Senator ought to read it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have read it, and I read it more dispassionately and with greater disinterestedness than the Senator from West Virginia read it.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Kentucky admits there is politics in relief. He admits that he knows it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know it now, yes; because I have read the report, and I presume no man who has any sense will fail to realize that so long as there is human nature in the human heart and in the human head there will be some politics in anything. I am willing to join the Senator or any other Senator or group of Senators in any effort to take politics not only out of relief, but out of all Federal expenditures, provided it is done in the same way in which other Federal or State problems are dealt with by legislation.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad that the Senator will join Mr. Hopkins in behalf of the Hatch amendment. We needed that help awfully bad in the last session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted against the Hatch amendment in the last session for the reasons that I then expressed, and if it were again offered under the same circumstances I would vote the same way. I sincerely hope that an amendment or a substantive law can be worked out here to take politics out of relief, but I do not believe we should pick out a particular group of the most unfortunate people in the country and deny to them the privilege that every other American enjoys.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad the Senator from Kentucky is going to join with us in cleaning up relief from all this political mess.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not joining with the Senator from West Virginia. I disclaim any intention of joining with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. If the Senator will not join with me, will he join with those who do stand for cleaning up relief from politics?

Mr. BARKLEY. If that question rises again, I will stand where I always stood. If the Senator is with those who are doing so, well and good, but I am not joining him.

Mr. HOLT. I am against politics in relief. I am for civil service. I have voted for measures to take politics out of relief and to uphold the civil service, and I welcome the opportunity to have the Senator join in such measures. I am glad that he is repenting and coming to the mourner's bench and joining us to take politics out of relief.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted to put the post-office employees under civil service, and I am ready to vote to incorporate in the appropriation measure which has been sent over here by the House a provision under which the President on the first day of February would cover the executive and supervisory officers of the W. P. A. into the civil service.

Mr. HOLT. I do not blame the Senator for being for that, because that blankets in all of his friends in Kentucky. I do not blame him one bit for being in favor of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am no more anxious to blanket in my friends than is the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. None of my friends are on the pay roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some of these days I may take the time and trouble to enlighten the Senator on the situation in Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad if the Senator from Kentucky would enlighten me with regard to the situation in Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator wants to be fair, and is not actuated by prejudice whatsoever.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from West Virginia has been actuated by prejudice many times.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want the Senator to have the full information, but in all likelihood the covering of the W. P. A. employees into the civil service will put as many of my enemies in as my friends. If the Senator had an open mind I could convince him about that. I did not have the support of all W. P. A. workers in Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad the Senator has an open heart and wants to blanket his enemies into the civil service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not say anything about an open heart. I spoke of an open mind.

Mr. HOLT. Whether those who are covered in are friends or enemies all amounts to the same thing, so long as they get on the civil-service list.

Mr. President, I am still waiting for somebody to tell me who if anyone got fired for playing politics in Kentucky. The Senator from Kentucky admits it was done. Everyone knows it. The W. P. A. knows it. Everyone knows it except Harry Hopkins. Those who played politics are still working for the W. P. A. in Kentucky, and waiting for the next election. Do not worry about that. They will be at work. It is most amusing and to me it is a most striking coincidence that the rolls of the W. P. A. in Kentucky mounted just before the primaries—

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield there?

Mr. HOLT. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator tell the Senate and the galleries and the country what the employment rolls in Kentucky were?

Mr. HOLT. I cannot.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then how does the Senator know the rolls mounted?

Mr. HOLT. I have read it, and I shall be glad, if the Senator wants me to do so, to put it into the Record. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record at this particular place the rolls of the W. P. A. before the primary, at the time of the primary, before the election, and at the time of the election, so as to verify my point. I ask that, Mr. President, because I do want to be fair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator from West Virginia seen those figures?

Mr. HOLT. I have not only seen them but I have studied them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how many people were on the rolls in Kentucky?

Mr. HOLT. I do not, but I know there is plenty for the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know that the pay rolls in Kentucky from the 1st day of January until the 1st day of September 1938 were not increased in proportion to the increases that were made in practically every other State in the Union? Does the Senator know that?

Mr. HOLT. I know that the—

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. HOLT. I cannot say that I actually know that to be a fact, but I know that the highest relief roll in America was on the Saturday before the general election, and it was cut immediately afterward. Mr. President, in order to be fair, I again ask the Senate for unanimous permission to put into the Record the rolls in Kentucky before the primary and at the time of the primary. I will get those figures and place them in the Record.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have here a tabulated statement.

Mr. HOLT. I ask the Senator if he objects to putting it in in my time.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I will put it in in my own time.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad that the Senator will do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have here a tabulated report of all the employees in all the States, for 1937 and 1938, down to and including the 31st day of December. I think the Senator will not find a single State in the Union in which the rolls were not increased during the summer months, not only of 1938 but of 1937, a year in which there was no election involved, either for the United States Senate or otherwise.

Mr. HOLT. Does the Senator mean to say that the rolls were increased in 1937?

Mr. BARKLEY. They were.

Mr. HOLT. I dispute that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will find when he looks at the records that the rolls were increased in 1937, for the very reason that in the construction of highways and other outdoor projects, the open season for work is in the spring, summer, and autumn.

In all the 48 States, beginning with January 1, 1938, and ending with December 31, 1938, there was a gradual increase in the pay roll, depending somewhat upon the season and weather conditions favorable to constructing highways and public buildings of all sorts. The same is true in 1937, when there occurred no congressional election, and there was no senatorial investigation.

The Senator referred specifically to Kentucky. I will say to him that a majority of the States in this list for 1938 show a higher percentage of increase in the pay roll from along in March until along in November, which represents the better season for outdoor construction, than is true of Kentucky. The percentage of increase was not as large in Kentucky as it was in a number of States. I will say to the Senator that in the State of Maryland there was probably a smaller increase in the total number of men and women on the pay rolls of the W. P. A. from January until December than in Kentucky, and several other States, including West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Texas.

Mr. HOLT. There was a reason why there were fewer put on the rolls in Maryland. They wanted to beat the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BARKLEY. There were fewer W. P. A. workers in proportion there. There have always been fewer W. P. A. workers in the State of Maryland in proportion to the population than in a number of other States of equal population, and I think that is a subject on which Maryland might be congratulated, because I presume it has been based upon a lesser need in Maryland than in other States of similar population in the United States.

Mr. HOLT. I wanted to read the number of W. P. A. workers. I did not know that I had the information on my desk, but I have found it.

W. P. A. workers March 1, 1937, 2,114,800.

November 1937, that had declined to 1,519,740, or nearly 600,000 workers.

Let us turn to 1938, since the Senator asked about it. I intended merely to mention it, but I am glad to put it in the Record, because the Senator made the point for me. In March 1938, we find on the W. P. A. pay rolls 2,394,843.

In November 1938, in the same comparable period, 3,216,400; or an increase of between 800,000 and 900,000 in election year 1938 as compared to a decrease of 600,000 in the off year of 1937.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same proportion would apply to West Virginia, and inasmuch as the Senator has not read it I will give it to him. March 1937 and 1938 in the State of West Virginia—

Mr. HOLT. Oh, I have been very much interested in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was no senatorial election in West Virginia in 1937.

Mr. HOLT. No; but they were interested in a bunch of fellows on the other side of the Capitol. Do not worry about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. In March 1937 on the rolls of the W. P. A. in West Virginia there were 2,148,000—

Mr. HOLT. Two million? We have only 1,800,000 people. Somebody is getting something.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was the amount of money spent. I was reading the wrong figure.

Mr. HOLT. It would not surprise me if there were 2,000,000 on the rolls.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was reading the amount of money spent, and not the number employed. I think the Senator read from the same list.

In March 1937 there were 47,482 people on the rolls in Kentucky. I think the Senator will recall that he was reading the amount of money, because he referred to two million.

Mr. HOLT. No; I was talking about the whole United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator was referring to Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. In March 1937 there were 47,482 on the rolls in Kentucky.

Mr. HOLT. How many were there in November?

Mr. BARKLEY. In November there were 39,652.

Mr. HOLT. Very well. Let us see about—

Mr. BARKLEY. In West Virginia there were 37,381 on the rolls in March 1937, and in December of the same year there were 28,806.

Mr. HOLT. While the Senator has the record before him, let us look at 1938.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that in March 1938 there were 48,285 in Kentucky. In December of that year—

Mr. HOLT. How many were there in November?

Mr. BARKLEY. In November there were 69,431.

Mr. HOLT. I do not think I need say any more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not through with the Senator's records. The Senator wants the whole record, does he not?

Mr. HOLT. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In West Virginia, in March 1938, there were 40,557. In November there were 43,117. Taking these figures at random, in the State of North Carolina in March 1938, there were 31,145; and in November there were 55,143.

In the State of Massachusetts, in which my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is interested, in March 1938 there were 97,708 persons on the W. P. A. rolls. In November of that same year there were 129,305 on the rolls.

In the State of Maryland, in March 1938, there were 12,021 persons on the rolls of the W. P. A., and in November there were 15,619.

I will say to the Senator that there have been increases in all these States, some of them a larger percentage than others. The percentage varies from March to November, because, in the first place, Congress appropriated a new sum of \$1,450,000,000 at the end of the last session, which was not available

for projects until after July 1, as the Senator knows, and, of course, there was an acceleration of the work all over the country during the summer months, as a result of the expenditure of the extra one and a half billion.

If the Senator will go through the list, which extends through the entire year 1937, and up to the end of 1938, he will find that in all the States, without regard to any election, whether there was an election for United States Senator, for Governor, or for any other office, there was a perfectly natural increase in the number of employees on the W. P. A., due to the appropriation of additional sums by Congress, and due to the fact that in the summer months, covering the period from March until November, a larger amount of outside work can be done, not only by the W. P. A., but by any other agency of Government which has outdoor work.

The Senator knows that a large proportion of the money was spent in the construction of highways, and that highways must be built when the weather is fair.

Much of the work was done in the construction of school-houses and other sorts of public buildings. The season for that sort of construction runs largely from March until November. In most parts of the country the weather is excellent until the latter part of November.

So, coming back to Kentucky, which the Senator has specifically mentioned, if the Senator will take the average increase between March and November, or between January 1 and December 31, 1938, and 1937, he will find that the proportion of men put on the pay roll of the W. P. A. in that State fell materially under the proportion put on in a number of other States, in which there was no contest for United States Senator.

Mr. HOLT. As I stated a moment ago, I do not believe I can add anything to what the Senator from Kentucky has said. He has given the figures. However, in order that the matter may be clear in our minds, the Senator spoke about the right season. I admit that 1938 was the proper season. There is no question about that. It was the political season. It was different in 1937. A moment ago I mentioned the fact that in the United States—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the figures he has given represent the number of relief workers, or the number of so-called administrative employees, or both?

Mr. BARKLEY. They represent both. I have before me the list for the entire country for the 2 years, and it speaks for itself. As I interpret it, it does not show that the number of W. P. A. employees was artificially boosted in any State. The number of employees will depend on the number of projects, and the number of projects will depend very largely on the ability of local communities to sponsor their part of the necessary cost, the average in my State being about 25 percent.

Let me also say to the Senator from West Virginia that on account of the inability of communities to vote bonds at any election except the 8th of November of last year, many desirable projects were denied, because October 1 was set as the dead line before which elections had to be held in order to authorize bonds. Because of the inability of towns, counties, and cities to vote bonds to enable them to expend their part of the necessary amount to construct any public building or enterprise, Kentucky, both in respect to the W. P. A. and the P. W. A., is under the quota of the amount of money to which she would have been entitled if the communities had qualified, or could have qualified by holding elections at which bond issues could have been authorized in order that the local community could pay its part of the expense. The Senator can verify that statement by inquiry at the W. P. A. and P. W. A. offices.

Mr. HOLT. I desire again to offer the record to show, as I said a moment ago, that the relief rolls were boosted in an election year and cut down in an off year. According to the W. P. A. there were 2,114,800 employees in March 1937. In November that number was reduced to 1,519,740,

or a reduction of approximately 600,000, while in 1938, an election year, in March there were 2,394,843 employees in the W. P. A. in the United States, and in November there were 3,216,400, or an increase of 822,000, figuring it roughly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not contend that in 1937 the W. P. A. spent less money than Congress had authorized it to spend, does he?

Mr. HOLT. I have never known the time when the W. P. A. did not spend more than Congress gave it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the number of men put on the rolls in any year must depend upon the amount of money available, and that amount is determined by Congress.

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not contend, would he, that in 1937 the W. P. A. spent less than the amount Congress had allowed it? And I take it he would not contend that in 1938 the W. P. A. spent more than the amount Congress allowed it. So the amount of the appropriation for 1937, as well as the amount of the appropriation for 1938, would determine the number of men and women who could be put on the W. P. A. rolls. Therefore, the question of how many men or women shall be put on the W. P. A. rolls is not a matter of caprice on the part of Mr. Hopkins, or anybody else. It depends on the amount of money Congress appropriates to put men and women on the rolls. I am assuming that in 1937 and in 1938 the W. P. A. put on all the men and woman that the appropriation made by Congress would justify.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator is absolutely correct in saying that the appropriation was lower in 1937 than in 1938.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then, why is it—

Mr. HOLT. Let me finish my answer. However, the Senator from Kentucky can probably tell us why the amount was higher in 1938 than in 1937. The Senator had much to do with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I cannot, any more than the Senator can, because the appropriation was made—

Mr. HOLT. I am not on the inside. I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is on the inside of the Senate, and the Senate had something to say about it. The Senator knows that the appropriation—

Mr. HOLT. I am not in the inner circle of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was nothing secret about the appropriation.

Mr. HOLT. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. The appropriation was openly debated in both the Senate and the House.

Mr. HOLT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from West Virginia participated in those debates, as he always does.

Mr. HOLT. Does not the Senator think that the Senator from West Virginia contributed to the debates?

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Senator not to ask me to commit myself on that question. The Senator always contributes to every debate. Just what he contributes may be subject to debate. However, the Senator was present, and he knows that the amount of money is not a secret.

Mr. HOLT. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. The matter was debated openly day by day in both the House and the Senate; and if Congress appropriated less money for 1937 than it did for 1938, Congress is responsible for it. It was not due to any election. If it was due to an election, Congress must accept its responsibility for appropriating more in 1938 than it did in 1937. So, the Senator is not fair with the W. P. A. or with anybody else when he says that the rolls were increased in 1938 because there was an election coming.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad that the Senator has joined the mourner's bench, and taken the responsibility.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am always eligible to join any mourner's bench. However, I do not want the hand of fellowship

extended to me by the Reverend Dr. HOLT, of West Virginia. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEWIS. I have no desire to interfere with what may be appreciative applause for any speaker on the floor of the Senate. However, in my position I must invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that the occupants of the galleries have been permitted to express their feelings in a form so violent and rude to the Senate, and so contrary to the dignity of the body, and so thoroughly opposed to what should be the courtesy accorded to the Senator speaking, that I now ask the Chair to instruct the galleries that, under the rules of the Senate, forms of expression such as have been indulged are not allowed and are not in harmony with the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order of the Senator from Illinois is well taken. The Chair at this time must admonish the occupants of the galleries to refrain from any audible approval or disapproval of any remarks that are made by any Senator upon the floor. The occupants of the galleries are here as the guests of the Senate, and order in the galleries must be maintained.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate fully that the point of order made by the Senator from Illinois is well taken. It is against the rules of the Senate for our guests in the galleries to give expressions of approval or disapproval. But, without regard to approval or disapproval, it is frequently difficult for the occupants of the galleries to refrain from an expression of amusement, which does not necessarily indicate approval or disapproval when something happens on the floor that amuses even the Members of the Senate who hear it. It is not always possible for the occupants of the galleries to exert more self-restraint than it is for the Members of the Senate themselves.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky may use more interesting figures, and, although he says he will join with me—and I will be glad to have him join me or stay where he is—nevertheless we are in the same position; we both now believe that politics should not be in relief. He did not believe that in 1938 before the primary, but nevertheless—

Mr. BARKLEY. I deny the right of the Senator to interpret my belief or say what I believe.

Mr. HOLT. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator state what he believes.

Mr. BARKLEY. My record here speaks for itself; I am not ashamed of it, and I am not apologizing for it or recanting anything I said when the question was under consideration.

Mr. HOLT. Would the Senator support the Hatch amendment if it were presented to the Senate today?

Mr. BARKLEY. There will probably be a Hatch amendment presented, and I hope—

Mr. HOLT. That does not answer my question.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I hope to be able to support an amendment that will in reality eliminate politics from relief. But if the Senator wants a specific answer from me—

Mr. HOLT. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to whether I would support the original Hatch amendment as it was offered in the Senate during the last Congress under the same circumstances, my answer is "No"; I would not do so. My reason for that is that, in my own conscience, I have never been willing to be so unfair, without criticizing the attitude of anyone else, to the most unfortunate class of our people who, in order to support their wives and children, must go on these public rolls, as to deny to them the same right possessed by every other American or any other office holder, including United States Senators. That is my attitude.

Mr. HOLT. I agree with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. And whenever any bill or amendment is brought before the Senate that will put W. P. A. workers on the same basis as every other worker or every other citizen, I will support it. But I said in that debate, and I repeat

now, that I do not think a United States Senator has any more rights under the Constitution of the United States than has the humblest man or woman who works on the W. P. A. rolls in any county of the United States.

Mr. HOLT. I agree with the Senator in that respect; that is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to welcome the Senator to the mourners bench.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I will yield in a moment. I have not just joined the bench, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky; I was in the first group that supported the proposal; and I wish to say further to the Senator from Kentucky that I agree with him that the humblest man in the country should have the same rights that we have. Therefore I protest with all the vigor that I have against "firing" W. P. A. workers who will not take orders from political bosses. We are not "fired" according to the whim of a boss; we may be purged but we are not fired. Nevertheless, going back to that, it is my contention that the W. P. A. workers should have the same opportunity as every other citizen, but they do not have it in America.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLT. Let me finish the thought.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. HOLT. Let me first finish my statement. They do not have the same opportunity, because the very day, as the Senator from Kentucky very well knows, that they become outspoken in their political beliefs against any party in power, in Kentucky or any other State, then they are "fired" and removed from the public rolls.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is not telling the accurate truth there.

Mr. HOLT. I ask the Senator to read the record as to Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of counties of my State—I do not care to name them here—where the proportion of Republican workers is much larger than that of Democrats right now, and none of them have been "fired" because they did not vote for me in the November election; and no Democrat who voted against me in the primary election has been "fired." The Senator cannot name one.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad that the Senator admits he is trying to get Republicans over. That method has been used in a number of States to put them on.

Mr. BARKLEY. Now the Senator is not being serious.

Mr. HOLT. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is not being fair. I am not trying to get Republicans over, though I welcome them when they decide to become Democrats. In the counties of Kentucky, I will say to the Senator, from the very beginning, due to the local situation to which I referred a while ago, where the local administration, instead of the W. P. A., determines who will go on the rolls, who can obtain work, we all get complaints about politics in the various counties. Other Senators get letters; I get them; all of us get them. The first administrator of W. P. A. in Kentucky was a Republican. He held office for 2 years until he was promoted to a regional office. I am not going into the question of the history of the W. P. A. in Kentucky, but many of the most serious complaints I received from many counties—and I think my colleague [Mr. LOGAN] will bear out my statement—most of the complaints which we have really received from Kentucky were due to the fact that in many of the counties the Republicans who were on the rolls, out of all proportion, outnumbered the Democrats.

Democrats protested, and, of course, I agree whether the protest was heeded or not by W. P. A. officers, that was not fair; there ought not to be an undue proportion of Republicans in any county or an undue proportion of Democrats on the rolls. I believe I can say, with absolute candor, that not a State director of the W. P. A. in any State in the United States has done so consistent a job of trying to keep

politics out of relief as has the administrator appointed for the State of Kentucky. There may have been other instances, but I do not approve them—

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. I knew nothing about them. I was not consulted about the cases. The report which has been presented shows that out of 120 counties in the State of Kentucky there were 2 counties in which foremen or area engineers took it upon themselves, without the knowledge of myself or without our consent or without the knowledge of anybody running my campaign or without the knowledge or approval of anybody above them in the W. P. A., to go out on the projects which they were supervising, and take action which might be criticized. I do not know the men themselves; but there was a large amount of confusion, I will say, in Kentucky in regard to registration.

Mr. HOLT. Yes; I will admit that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the Senator would be serious for a moment. The legislature was considering, I will say to the Senator, early last year the enactment of a law which would give to the chief executive of the State the right to appoint boards in each county to determine who might vote in a primary election. In one county 1,500 men had their right to vote challenged, and they were required to go to the county seat and defend their right to vote. Some of them had lived in their present homes for 30 years; yet they were challenged; and not only that, but heretofore anybody who was unregistered or who had changed his voting place could go within the last 2 weeks before the primary or general election and register if he had become of age or if he had become a voter or if he had moved from one precinct to another. In the very midst of the contest in 1938 in Kentucky the legislature passed a law moving that date up 60 days, so that many of the voters of the State were uninformed and were confused about their right as to when and where and how they could change or correct their registration.

In one of the offices, in one of the regions of the State, in order that information might be given to employees who had made many verbal requests for information about their right to vote and register, there were, as I understand from the committee report—and I never knew of it until the committee made its report—mimeograph forms of instructions sent out to workers on the projects, not with a view to determining how any of them was going to vote but with a view of determining whether they were registered and to give them the information that would enable them to register in order that they might take part either in the Democratic or Republican primary, for under the laws of Kentucky a registered Republican may not vote in a Democratic primary and a registered Democrat may not vote in a Republican primary.

I am informed—and the committee's report so shows—that in these mimeograph forms which were sent out giving this information there was no effort made to find to what political party an individual belonged or for whom he intended to vote for United States Senator. It may be that that was improper. It may be that these lists of employees in the particular counties are not public property; but the testimony of the man who supervised them says that he regarded them as public property; that anybody who wanted them and would come for them could have gotten them, and that he thought he was doing a public duty as an American citizen in informing these unfortunate people what their rights were in qualifying themselves to vote, if they desired to vote.

When everybody is obtaining all sorts of lists from every possible source, I myself think it is quite technical to say that any drastic punishment should have been meted out to a man who simply tried to help his employees in qualifying to vote according to their own sentiments in an election which was pending at that time.

Mr. HOLT. I should like now to quote the Sheppard committee report on Kentucky. On page 36 it says what I shall

now read. I did not investigate Kentucky, but I desire to read what the report said on August 2, 1938:

The evidence thus far presented to it convinces the committee that a deplorable situation exists in Kentucky. It is certain that organized efforts have been, and are being made to control the vote of those on relief work, and that contributions have been sought and obtained from Federal employees in behalf of one of the senatorial candidates. It is equally certain that State officials charged in part with the distribution of Federal funds for old-age assistance and for unemployment compensation have been required to contribute from their salaries and of their services in the interest of another candidate for the United States Senate.

Then the committee—a Democratic committee entirely—make this statement. Here is what the said about Kentucky:

These facts should arouse the conscience of the country. They imperil the right of the people to a free and unpolluted ballot.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator say what the date of that was?

Mr. HOLT. It says on page 36 that it was for release after the committee meeting on August 2, 1938.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was a press release?

Mr. HOLT. Yes; from the committee. It was the committee speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Within 4 days of the primary, that press release was issued, as I understand.

Mr. HOLT. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was on the 2d of August.

Mr. HOLT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The investigator from the committee was not sent to Kentucky until about the 20th or 25th of July, and remained there until the 28th day of October, and the committee did not make its official report on Kentucky until within the past 2 weeks.

Mr. HOLT. That is correct. I wish I had time to go into the State of Kentucky. It may be advisable for me to speak tomorrow on Kentucky, because this is what the report, on page 11, says about Kentucky. It speaks about the Stokes charges, and in the second paragraph it says:

The committee's representative, and the force assisting him, after investigation, made a report sustaining the staff writer in a majority of the charges and concurring with Mr. Hopkins in four instances.

There were 22 charges.

The findings of the committee's investigator in reference to these charges indicated solicitation of W. P. A. employees and officials for contributions to the campaign funds of Candidate —.

The rules of the Senate do not let me say who it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will supply the name. I suppose the rules do not prohibit me from saying.

Mr. HOLT. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was the candidate referred to there.

Mr. HOLT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HOLT. Let me finish this, and then I will be glad to yield. The report says:

The findings of the committee's investigator in reference to these charges indicated solicitation of W. P. A. employees and officials for contributions to the campaign funds of Candidate—

The Senator furnished the name—

and a systematic canvassing of W. P. A. employees as to preference in the race for the Democratic senatorial nomination. These activities, so far as solicitations were concerned, were carried on mainly by private parties not connected with W. P. A., but in some instances by W. P. A. officials. Canvassing activities were carried on by W. P. A. officials entirely.

Then the report goes ahead and discusses Kentucky; but I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to some newspaper articles written by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes—

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who represented the Scripps-Howard newspapers—who was sent into Kentucky early in the spring to investigate the situation in Kentucky with respect to the use of W. P. A. funds and employees in the senatorial contest?

At that time there were about 60,000 employees on the W. P. A. rolls in Kentucky. Mr. Stokes found 22 cases out

of 60,000 in which he thought the conduct of the person referred to was reprehensible; and I admit, for the sake of argument, that if what he said about the conduct was true it was reprehensible. The committee investigating the matter found that in 18 of the cases that was the situation; that is, they considered the testimony of the person who made the charge, and considered the denial of the person against whom the charge was made, and then held that 18 out of the 22 charges were sustained.

Of course, these charges were called to the attention of Mr. Hopkins by the committee, and he sent his investigators down there to investigate, and they took affidavits and took what they thought would be credible evidence on the subject; and all of the charges were denied by Mr. Hopkins except two, in which instances he admitted that the charges were sustained.

So that really presents a difference of only 16 cases between the finding of the committee and the charges of Mr. Stokes, who was the newspaperman who went down there and with a fine-tooth comb combed the State of Kentucky for evidence against the W. P. A. and found 22 cases out of 60,000, 18 of which were sustained by the committee out of 60,000 workers.

Now, should Mr. Hopkins be blamed for that sort of thing if he was not responsible for it, if he knew nothing about it, but after it was called to his attention he sent his own investigating force there to look into it?

The Senator says he does not credit the report of that kind of investigators; but I do not know of any other department that does not do the same thing. If you make a charge against a postmaster or a rural mail carrier, the Post Office Department sends its own inspector to investigate the charge. If you make a charge against somebody in the Department of Justice, the Department sends out its own investigating force. The same thing is true of the Treasury Department. The same thing is true of the Federal Trade Commission. All the departments send their own investigating forces to investigate charges made with respect to their employees.

Mr. HOLT. I want to add right there that the investigating forces in those departments are under civil service, while investigators on W. P. A. are under the political coercion of a boss. There is a great difference there. The investigators know, in the case of the other departments, that they can report frankly and not lose their jobs.

Mr. BARKLEY. That means that in the opinion of the Senator the moral fiber of men not under civil service who are appointed to investigate charges is less than that which obtains in the case of those who are under civil service.

Mr. HOLT. No; but the Senator—

Mr. BARKLEY. I stand ready—

Mr. HOLT. I should like to answer in my own time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stand ready to put those men under civil service; but they were not under civil service because Congress never put them there.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Kentucky knows just as well as I know that if the political ax of a man's job is over his head, if he brings in an unfavorable report, that is economic coercion. Congress has passed so many, many times on that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think that even in Kentucky, which he desires to paint in such black terms—

Mr. HOLT. No; I am just taking what the Sheppard committee says.

Mr. BARKLEY. Out of 60,000 employees, they find that 18 have gone beyond the bounds of propriety and against the instructions of the head of the W. P. A., without the knowledge of any responsible manager of any candidate for public office in that State. Does the Senator think that because of those 18 cases Mr. Hopkins ought to be denied confirmation, when he never knew anything about them until they were called to his attention officially, and then made an investigation in the regular way to ascertain the correctness and the merits of the charges, and admitted 2 of them and denied 20, while the committee of investigation sustained the charges in 18 cases? Does the Senator seriously think that in those circumstances Mr. Hopkins ought to be denied confirmation on account of those transactions in the State of Kentucky?

Mr. HOLT. I will answer the Senator by saying that the Senator from West Virginia is going to vote against Mr. Hopkins' confirmation. There is no question about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that the Senator from West Virginia would have voted against Mr. Hopkins' confirmation if there had never been a Senate committee appointed to investigate W. P. A.

Mr. HOLT. Yes; because I knew him better than they did a long while ago. I want to say, however, since the Senator from Kentucky talks about a man going down to Kentucky and finding only 22 instances, that here is a newspaper reporter from Washington, with no connection with Kentucky, going down there and in a few days finding this condition of affairs. The Sheppard committee only had twenty-odd investigators, and, of course, they could not send many investigators down there; but it is my honest opinion—

Mr. BARKLEY. There were five.

Mr. HOLT. They sent five investigators to cover the 60,000 people and find out whether there was any politics in relief. The Senator from Kentucky knows that the committee was not amply provided with investigators to get down to the bottom of the rotten political situation in Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kentucky knows nothing of the sort. The Senate committee had \$80,000 available. I do not know how much of it they used.

Mr. HOLT. For thirty-odd States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether they used all of it or whether they had a surplus left. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, they had a surplus of about fifteen or twenty thousand dollars left.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the committee did its work on about \$55,000.

Mr. HOLT. And did a good job.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they could have used fifteen or twenty thousand dollars more if they had wanted to use it. So the Senator's statement is not correct that the committee was handicapped for lack of funds.

Mr. HOLT. I did not say that. I said they were handicapped for lack of investigators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, they used the only investigators they could have employed. I do not know how many they had. I do not know how many States they went into; but if they used \$60,000, say, and had \$20,000 left, they could have employed at least a third more investigators, if they needed them, than they actually employed with the \$60,000.

Mr. HOLT. No; they wanted to stay, and properly so, within their budget.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would have stayed within their budget if they had spent \$20,000 more.

Mr. HOLT. No; the Senator knows that when they got down in Kentucky, if they had employed enough investigators, it would have cost \$75,000 to investigate Kentucky alone.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator from Kentucky does not know that, and the Senator from West Virginia does not know it.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from West Virginia does know it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator does not know it. He does not know that, and there are a good many things the Senator from West Virginia does not know that he asserts here as matters of fact.

Mr. HOLT. There are a number of things the Senator from West Virginia does not know, but he knows there is politics in the W. P. A. in Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am astonished that the Senator from West Virginia should admit that there is anything he does not know.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator will admit many things, but that is one thing he will not admit. He knows there is plenty of politics in Kentucky, and he would also like to know why the peculiar conference with the W. P. A. director was held in Kentucky just before the campaign. Of course, he came up just to pass greetings with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is that the Senator is talking about?

Mr. HOLT. I said the W. P. A. administrator for Kentucky conferred with the Senator from Kentucky before the primary.

Mr. BARKLEY. The W. P. A. administrator in Kentucky has his headquarters at Louisville, where my headquarters were. He was never around my headquarters.

Mr. HOLT. That is very good, to have them in the same city.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. George H. Goodman, the director of the W. P. A. in Kentucky, is a friend of mine, and I saw him frequently, but I never conferred with Mr. Goodman before the primary about W. P. A. workers, or about the use of political funds, or W. P. A. funds or workers in the primary, and I did not confer with him about the primary immediately before the primary election, or otherwise. Is the Senator satisfied?

Mr. HOLT. No; the Senator still says there is politics in Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator talked about a conference I had, and there was no such conference.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad the Senator changed the name of it. [Laughter.] We were discussing the number of people on W. P. A. rolls in the United States bearing directly on the election, and the Senator from Kentucky rose in all his oratory, and oratorical style, and his good nature, which I enjoy, and which I like, and tried to criticize me by saying, "Do you mean to say that the rolls varied with elections," and then, when he started to read the figures, he read them more and more softly as he proceeded. Nevertheless, I want to read the figures again, I want to show what happened.

In the State of Kentucky, in March 1937, according to his own statement, there were 47,482 employees on the W. P. A. This was not an election year. In November of 1937, I think he said, the number had been reduced to 39,652, or a difference of 7,830, as I count quickly, who went off the W. P. A. roll, in the State of Kentucky alone.

Let us look at the figures for 1938, and see what happened. According to the statement he gave, in March 1938 there were 48,285, and in November the small number of 69,431, or a difference of 21,146 people. In other words, in 1937 in Kentucky the rolls went down by nearly 8,000, in an off year, and in an election year went up by 21,000. There may not be any politics to it, each Senator may determine that for himself; but I think there was.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator read the figures for the same period for the State of Georgia, for the State of Louisiana, and for the State of Texas?

Mr. HOLT. I do not have them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator had them.

Mr. HOLT. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have them. Will the Senator read them?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have them put in, too.

Mr. HOLT. In the State of Louisiana in March there were 31,120 on the W. P. A. rolls. In November there were 54,649, as compared with 31,120. There was an increase in Louisiana, but it was an election year.

Mr. BARKLEY. What election was there in Louisiana in which the question was involved?

Mr. HOLT. I do not know; but it was an election year.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is talking about it being an election year, and he is assuming that the increase was due to some election in Louisiana. What election was it?

Mr. HOLT. I could not say.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the Senator does not know that it was due to it being an election year?

Mr. HOLT. I have my—

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has his suspicions? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. Oh, yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist on the rule requiring Senators to address the Chair be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and Senators will comply with the rule.

Mr. HOLT. All I can say is—and the records prove it—that the W. P. A. roll went up in 1938 and went down in 1937. There is no question about that. That is the fact, whether the Congress is responsible, whether the people were responsible, whether Hopkins was responsible; the relief rolls went up in an election year and went down in an off year, except in the State of Maryland, as the Senator has said, where they were quite interested in the rolls not going up. It is most interesting to check the States where the purges were on. I did not know this was of so much interest to the Senator from Kentucky, so tomorrow, when the debate continues, I hope to put in the RECORD figures showing how the rolls went up before the purge primaries. I think it would be quite interesting to show those bounds upward and down, as Elderman showed them in a cartoon in the Washington Post. He said, "There's gold in them thar hills." So there was "gold in them thar hills" up and down, depending on the elections.

In the State of Massachusetts, the figures just given, I repeat, in March 1938, 97,000 people were on the W. P. A. roll. In November 1938 there were 129,000, or a difference of 32,000 more in the State of Massachusetts; and there was an election there. No one will question that.

I should like to have Senators check—and I hope it will be in my time tomorrow—the business index of the country, which will show many, many times that as business was going up so were the W. P. A. rolls; but the W. P. A. rolls have never gone up in an off year but have always gone up in a direct election year.

You may say there is no politics in it if you care to, but, as Aubrey Williams says, "Vote for the boys that are with you." This is not a direct quotation but the thought. Harry Hopkins said in Minnesota, "You should keep those in power who give you the most," and certain people gave them the most. So we find a constant increase in W. P. A. rolls.

I want to quote Mr. Hopkins actually and directly so that he cannot squirm out of it. This is what he said in Minnesota:

There is nothing wrong in supporting the political group that will give you the most.

And that is what he meant. He meant they should support them.

We find a peculiar thing, that the depression passed on the 5th day of November. Is that not peculiar, that we reached the hump of business recession on the 5th day of November, and now we are sailing down the road, and the relief rolls are being cut daily?

I know what was behind it and you know what was behind it. Those men were put on the rolls for the purpose to help in the election in those years in the States named. I want to give those again and again as time goes on.

May I ask the Senator from Kentucky how long he intends to have the Senate sit today?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had hoped we might vote this afternoon, but if the Senator intends to talk very much longer, I think the Senate would be compelled in self defense to take a rest.

Mr. HOLT. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky—

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we will remain in session until at least 5 o'clock, and then we can determine what we will do. I hope the Senator can conclude by that time.

Mr. HOLT. I will say that I cannot conclude by 5 o'clock. I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator tell me how much longer beyond that time he would wish to speak?

Mr. HOLT. At quite some length; but I should be glad to act according to the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean about stopping the speech? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. No; I will not go that far with the Senator from Kentucky, because I would be sitting down now if I were consulting his wishes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator told me when he started that he intended to speak about 2 hours, and he has spoken now about 4 hours.

Mr. HOLT. I expect it seems like that to the Senator, but it was not quite that long.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seemed longer, to be perfectly frank. I held out the hope at the last session of the Senate that if we could dispose of this nomination today we would adjourn over until Monday, but if we cannot do that, I do not desire to hold the Senate so very late, if we have to meet tomorrow. We can conclude the session about 5, if the Senator is not through by that time.

Mr. HOLT. We can go on until 5, or stop now, as the Senator desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. HOLT. Now, concerning Mr. Hopkins and his place in politics, which was discussed at some length, I think it would be quite interesting at this time to have the clerk read and to put into my speech an editorial from the Parkersburg News entitled "Greatest Indictment." I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the editorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

GREATEST INDICTMENT

There follows here an editorial from the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper. It is reprinted because it deals with a subject, the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated. It should be understood the Scripps-Howard newspapers originally supporters of President Roosevelt before his first nomination and until recently have given generous approval of the present administration. When it says the Sheppard committee report is "the greatest indictment of mass political prostitution the country has ever seen" the seriousness of this situation must be realized. It should be remembered too that one of the chief beneficiaries, Senator BARKLEY, has not only been reelected, but has again become the majority leader and that Hopkins and Williams, who were responsible for this situation, have been rewarded by new offices of even greater importance.

The editorial follows:

"Now comes the time to complete the record on a certain controversy.

"Last June, Thomas L. Stokes, reporter for The News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, went into Kentucky to write about the primary campaign of Senator 'Dear ALBEN' BARKLEY and Gov. 'Happy' Chandler.

"He found, and reported, that the Chandler State machine was systematically shaking down State employees for contributions and compelling them to support Candidate Chandler. Those findings were never denied.

"Reporter Stokes also found, and reported, that the Barkley Federal machine was shaking down Federal jobholders and resorting to widespread coercive practices to compel W. P. A. relief workers to support Candidate BARKLEY. He listed 22 specific instances of W. P. A. in politics."

Those findings created a considerable stir. W. P. A. Administrator Harry Hopkins put on a great show of W. P. A. investigating itself, and then with an air of righteous indignation gave out a press release taking up those 22 "alleged" instances one by one and proclaiming that in only 2 of the 22 instances could W. P. A. investigators find evidence to support the accuracy of what Reporter Stokes had reported.

Then Senator SHEPPARD's campaign expenditures committee took up the trail. Over the months the committee has released preliminary reports of its findings. Now the Sheppard committee has turned in its final report. And here is the score:

Mr. Stokes reported 22 W. P. A. abuses. Mr. Hopkins denied 20. Senate investigators sustained Mr. Hopkins on only four counts.

Considering the time the W. P. A. chisellers had to cover their tracks before the Senate investigators got into Kentucky, we think the final reckoning looks pretty good for Tom Stokes—and pretty sad for Harry Hopkins.

Kentucky was only one of the many States where the Sheppard committee investigators found W. P. A. up to its ears in politics. Tennessee, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey—wherever they went it was the same sordid story.

Politicians on the public pay roll devoting their time and energies not to public service but to political campaigning. Wanton misuse for political ends of Government funds and labor and materials furnished by the Government. Unfortunate citizens, working on W. P. A. projects for a meager livelihood, herded and bossed and intimidated by political ward heelers. W. P. A. ditch diggers fired because they wouldn't promise to vote for certain candidates. Women on W. P. A. sewing projects shaken down for campaign contributions—ad infinitum, ad nauseum. Vote right or starve!

The Sheppard committee report is perhaps the greatest indictment of mass political prostitution the country has ever seen. And we're not forgetting the callous days of Boies Penrose and

Mark Hanna when the bosses posted notices on factory doors. Admittedly it may be that what was done in W. P. A. only seems worse because it was done under the cloak of humanitarianism and because all the while the top W. P. A. administrators were so unctuously holier than thou.

Well, a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since the primary and general elections. In a great many States the W. P. A. highbinders found their brute force and threat technique didn't work, once citizens got inside the voting booths—just as the old-time partisan Republican employers found they couldn't scare their workers by posting notices on factory doors.

Tom Stokes is still at his old job, still a working reporter of facts. Harry Hopkins has gone on to a politician's reward—a place in the Cabinet. His right-hand man, former Deputy Administrator Aubrey Williams, has been shunted out of the line of fire, assigned exclusively to running the National Youth Administration. The difficult and important task of restoring the W. P. A. to what it was originally intended to be—an organization to provide jobs for unemployed men and women (not to provide votes for politicians)—has been turned over to an Army officer, Colonel Harrington.

And the Sheppard committee has recommended that Congress enact a great number of new laws "to make impossible, so far as legislation can do so, further offenses of this character."

That gigantic task of reform lies ahead. All citizens who cherish our democratic form of government should insist that on this issue their lawmakers stand up and be counted.

Mr. HOLT. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire me to continue with my speech?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLT. I shall now leave the State of Kentucky, and discuss the State of Pennsylvania. Although I shall not be able to conclude my discussion before the Senate recesses, I do wish to discuss Pennsylvania quite at some length. I want to quote from page 23 of the report on senatorial campaign expenditures, as follows:

The committee took up the charges of Senator JAMES J. DAVIS with respect to the activities of W. P. A. officials and employees in the Pennsylvania election. For the text of the DAVIS' charges, see part 2 of this report entitled "Summary of Cases by States." The committee heard evidence from its investigators that owners of trucks used on W. P. A. projects were solicited for \$100 each in Carbon County, Pa.; that owners of trucks were requested by W. P. A. officials to visit the representative of a certain political leader at his home; that on one occasion 10 or 12 were at the home of this political leader at one time, and the committee has been furnished with affidavits that 7 were solicited there; that 4 promised contributions to the campaign and afterward made part or full payments on these contributions.

Here we find Mr. Hopkins' own group soliciting money from truck operators under the W. P. A. Mr. Hopkins is a man who does not believe in politics in relief, a man who does not believe in politics in the W. P. A., and yet the report shows what I have read.

I should like to read the development of the truck situation in Pennsylvania, and read about the banquets which were held. Not only did they knock down, or rake down, or in some way take money from those who owned trucks and worked on W. P. A., for the Democratic campaign fund of Pennsylvania, but they held banquets. Here is a ticket to one which was held on the 11th day of October 1938. It says:

Banquet sponsored by W. P. A. truck owners and operators, Fort Stanwix Hotel, Johnstown, Pa., October 11, 1938, 8 p. m.

Under that:

Tickets, \$1.50.

We find here a definite, determined, concerted effort in the State of Pennsylvania not only to club the W. P. A. officials into contributing money, but going to the truck owners and operators they had under contract. Why did they do that? Because the W. P. A. can either use their trucks or not use their trucks. If politically favored they can find their trucks perfectly satisfactory. If they are not politically favored they can find some little mechanical difficulty in the trucks that would keep them from being used. Therefore the truck owners of the State of Pennsylvania, under the threat of coercion, under the threat of losing their trucking, had to donate money to what, in my opinion, is one of the worst political machines this country has ever known. The machine may not actually be the worst in its effectiveness, but there has never been a machine

in America which has hit the gutter type of politics as did the Pennsylvania machine which was then menacing W. P. A. workers. I shall discuss at quite some length tomorrow the question of truck owners and truck operators in the State of Pennsylvania.

In the committee report we find this statement:

The committee heard from its investigators testimony with respect to the activities of officials and employees of the W. P. A. in Luzerne County, Pa. Investigators reported that 18 relief workers on a W. P. A. project near Wilkes-Barre were ordered transferred from this project, which was near their homes, to a project located some 35 or 40 miles from their homes.

No coercion? No politics in relief? Because certain poor unfortunate men on relief would not go along with the political machine in Pennsylvania they were transferred to a project 35 or 40 miles from their homes. Oh, no; Mr. Hopkins says there is no politics in relief. Mr. Hopkins says there could not be anything but political purity about the distribution of relief funds. Yet we find that same condition going on in Pennsylvania today, and it will continue to go on until the administration cleans up relief, and cleans up the Works Progress Administration.

Quoting from the Sheppard report again:

The investigators stated that the reason for this transfer action was that these workers were wearing Republican buttons at work and had registered Republican.

Is that not a crime? Here is a W. P. A. worker out digging a ditch, making enough to feed himself and his family, and he wears a Republican button during a campaign. Therefore he was to be transferred 35 or 40 miles from his home, knowing that he could not get to the project, in order that he might know who the political boss of the State of Pennsylvania was, and in order that the political control of Pennsylvania could be continued under the present group.

Oh, yes; we do not find any individuals transferred 30 or 40 miles who wear the buttons of those people in charge of the Pennsylvania political situation. No; we do not find any of that. The report goes on to say:

The State assistant district attorney for Luzerne County took up the complaints of these workers with the W. P. A. authorities, after they had been transferred, and was told by the W. P. A. director for Luzerne County that they had been retransferred to a project near their homes.

Here they were, transferred 35 or 40 miles from their homes, and only after public pressure, after the State district attorney had intervened, do we find that they were transferred back to where they could earn enough for a living for themselves, their wives, and their children. Yet the hypocrisy of some individuals saying there is no politics in relief. The hypocrisy of saying that Harry Hopkins knew nothing about that, whereas he knew that the set-up in Pennsylvania, this machine, not only tolerated but continued these things.

The W. P. A. director for Luzerne County advised the committee's investigators that in his opinion, after his investigation, the complaint was true, and for that reason he had ordered the retransfer of the men to a project near their homes.

Men trying to earn a living on a W. P. A. project were so indiscreet as to wear Republican campaign buttons. They were transferred 35 miles from their homes and would still be working there if at all if they could get to their jobs. There was no way to reach that situation until public opinion brought pressure to bear.

The W. P. A. is not being cleaned up today from within. The W. P. A. is being cleaned up because public opinion forced a clean-up, because the people of the United States were not willing further to tolerate corruption and politics in relief. Many of those who are now joining the parade to clean up relief were not sincere when relief needed cleaning up. They were quiet in 1936. They were quiet in 1937. They were quiet in 1938. However, they have now become vocal in some instances in cleaning up relief in 1939. Why? Because it is more popular to tell the truth in 1939 than it was in 1938.

Corruption in relief will continue as long as it is tolerated by the people. It would be tolerated and promoted by the

politicians. We find this patronage mess of the W. P. A. particularly bad in the State of Pennsylvania. However, public opinion forced the W. P. A. itself to clean house.

The report of the committee states that the investigation further disclosed that more were transferred to that particular group.

We could go ahead with many, many charges against the W. P. A. in the State of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania W. P. A. was owned, lock, stock, and barrel by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GURFEY], and it was to be used for his political ends. It was his to do with as he desired. Men were to be fed or to be starved at his wish and the wish of those who were his subordinates. That was the condition in Pennsylvania—a condition which, in my opinion, smells to high heaven. That condition was repudiated by the people of the State of Pennsylvania in no uncertain terms.

If there is one thing that helped contribute to the defeat of the Democratic Party in the State of Pennsylvania, it was the rotten condition and corruption of the Works Progress Administration itself.

The condition was known by Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins had the facts with regard to the boss of the Pennsylvania situation. But did he give them out? No. He kept them just as closely as he could, and to this day we have never heard Mr. Hopkins say anything more about the Pennsylvania political situation than that it was "a rough campaign." A rough campaign! Oh, yes; it was rough for the hungry people of Pennsylvania, who had to depend for their food and shelter upon the boss of a political machine who was dispensing the Federal money as he desired to dispense it, and as he desired to control it. It is a shame and a disgrace that the American people did not know of the situation before.

Of course, Mr. Hopkins is being promoted to the Department of Commerce. Why? In order to move him from the line of fire of the W. P. A. investigation. In other words, the purpose is to transfer him to a more secure place, so that if we start going after the W. P. A. it can be said "Well, Mr. Hopkins is not there any more. The Administration has changed." It was considered good political strategy to move him over to the Department of Commerce and try to silence all opposition to him.

However, facts are facts; and sooner or later the American people will know the true facts about the scandalous handling of relief. When the people know the facts, it is my honest and sincere opinion that the trail will lead into the office of Harry Hopkins himself. I think Harry Hopkins definitely, openly, and purposely put politics in the W. P. A. Why? He has political ambitions himself. I shall not discuss his political ambitions tonight. Nevertheless, sooner or later, I shall discuss the true facts with respect to the W. P. A. in the State of Pennsylvania and other States.

Back in 1938, when I brought forward some of these charges in the State of Pennsylvania, they were denied by Mr. Hopkins. They were denied by the political bosses of the Democratic Party. However, the charges were true. They were just as true as the other statements I have been making with respect to the Works Progress Administration. They were true because they were supported by the facts which had been gathered. When the true facts are known, we shall know the whole case.

Mr. President, I shall not continue any longer tonight, but I shall speak tomorrow. I do not care whether or not I speak immediately after the convening of the Senate. However, at this time I shall conclude for the day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will read the remaining nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations for promotions in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations for promotions in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar with the exception of that of Mr. Hopkins.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in regard to the confirmation of the nominations of Mr. Murphy as Attorney General and Mr. Frankfurter as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified in both those instances.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 20, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 17), 1939

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas D. Samford, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama. (Mr. Samford is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 2, 1938.)

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Carpenter Robert L. Blanchett to be a chief carpenter in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from January 1, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Maj. Walter Alexander Pashley, Quartermaster Corps, from January 16, 1939.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. James Edward Dooley, Infantry, from January 12, 1939.

Capt. John Max Lentz, Field Artillery, from January 16, 1939.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Commander John H. Magruder, Jr., to be a captain in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1939.

Lt. Comdr. Jerome L. Allen to be a commander in the Navy, to rank from the 23d day of June 1938.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Joseph N. Wenger, June 23, 1938.

Paul F. Dugan, June 23, 1938.

Murr E. Arnold, September 8, 1938.

Valentine L. Pottle, November 2, 1938.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George K. MacKenzie, Jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, to rank from the 21st day of September 1938.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 6th day of June 1938:

Roger M. Keithly

Sam C. Loomis, Jr.

The following-named citizens of the United States to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 31st day of December 1938:

Edward F. Ritter, Jr.	John T. Cangelosi
Johns S. Shaver	Wallace E. Allen
Leslie G. Seebach	Lewis S. Sims, Jr.
Richard A. Rasmussen	Robert C. Ray

Pay Director Arthur F. Huntington to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, to rank from the 17th day of August 1928.

Civil Engineer Ralph M. Warfield to be a civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, to rank from the 1st day of November 1938.

Boatswain John Lickwar to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 22d day of October 1938.

Gunner Charles A. Coombs to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of December 1938.

Electrician Louis G. Giard to be a chief electrician in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 22d day of October 1938.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 17), 1939

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be brigadier general

William P. Upshur

To be colonels

Harry Schmidt	Henry L. Larsen
Earl C. Long	William H. Rupertus
Selden B. Kennedy	Harry K. Pickett
Miles R. Thacher	Allen H. Turnage

To be lieutenant colonels

Evans O. Ames	Joseph T. Smith
Emmett W. Skinner	Raymond E. Knapp
Merritt B. Curtis	Omar T. Pfeiffer
Charles N. Muldrow	Lewie G. Merritt
James D. McLean	Claude A. Larkin

To be majors

Gordon Hall	Clarence R. Wallace
Max D. Smith	Ronald A. Boone
David A. Stafford	William B. Onley
Erwin Mehlinger	James H. Strother
Donald Spicer	Ivan W. Miller
Frank P. Snow	Joe N. Smith
Chesley G. Stevens	Louis E. Marie, Jr.
Walter W. Wensinger	James S. Monahan
Lawson H. M. Sanderson	John A. Bemis
Jacob F. Plachta	John C. McQueen
Harold E. Rosecrans	Howard N. Kenyon
Leo Sullivan	William W. Davies
Hayne D. Boyden	Vernon E. Megee
Franklin G. Cowie	James M. Smith
Christian F. Schilt	Ernest E. Linsert
Walter A. Wachtler	Orin H. Wheeler
William E. Maxwell	Lewis A. Hohn

To be captains

Samuel G. Taxis	Joseph P. McCaffery
Mercade A. Cramer	John B. Hendry
James B. Lake, Jr.	Frederick B. Winfree
Chandler W. Johnson	Samuel D. Puller
George R. Weeks	Ernest R. West
Clifton R. Moss	Roger W. Beadle
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.	Robert R. Porter
Frederick L. Wieseman	Ellsworth N. Murray
Robert S. Brown	Howard J. Turton
Harlan C. Cooper	Thomas J. Colley
Robert E. Fojt	Walter Asmuth, Jr.
Billy W. King	Alpha L. Bowser, Jr.
George R. E. Shell	Marvin T. Starr
James H. Brower	George Corson

To be first lieutenants

Robert E. Cushman	Frank P. Hager, Jr.
Charles W. Shelburne	Elmer E. Brackett, Jr.
Richard G. Weede	William T. Fairbourn
Charles O. Bierman	Custis Burton, Jr.
Frederick A. Ramsey, Jr.	Clayton O. Totman
William N. McGill	George H. Brockway
Carl A. Laster	Harold G. Walker
Leonard K. Davis	Bruno A. Hochmuth
Elmer T. Dorsey	Thomas F. Riley
Earl A. Sneeringer	Frederick P. Henderson
Merlyn D. Holmes	Donald J. Decker
Lewis J. Fields	Michael Sampas
Bruce T. Hemphill	Charles W. Harrison
James W. Crowther	Frederick E. Leek
Edwin P. Pennebaker, Jr.	William R. Wendt
Wallace M. Nelson	Arthur A. Chidester
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.	John A. Anderson
Dixon Goen	Gordon A. Bell
Herman Nickerson, Jr.	Robert A. McGill
Richard H. Crockett	James M. Clark
Wesley M. Platt	Peter J. Speckman
George A. Roll	Roy L. Kline
Floyd R. Moore	Odell M. Conoley
Chevey S. White	Louie C. Rineberg
Marvin H. Floom	William W. Buchanan
Richard E. Thompson	Jack Tabor
Kenneth F. McLeod	John W. Easley
Willard C. Fiske	Frank L. Kilmartin
James G. Frazer	Eschol M. Mallory
Robert E. Stannah	Robert D. Moser
Stanley W. Trachta	Joseph N. Renner
Carey A. Randall	Clyde R. Huddieson
Ronald B. Wilde	William R. Collins
William S. McCormick	Norman Van Dam
William J. Van Ryzin	John J. Nilan, Jr.
Albert F. Metze	Herbert H. Williamson
Joe C. McHaney	Leo R. Smith
Gould P. Groves	John C. Miller, Jr.
Donn C. Hart	Dwight M. Guillotte
Eugene F. Syms	Thomas S. Ivey
Wilmer E. Barnes	Loren S. Fraser
John W. Stage	William E. Boles
Kenyth A. Damke	Harry O. Smith, Jr.
Kenneth D. Bailey	Joseph L. Winecoff
Raymond L. Murray	James S. O'Halloran
John S. Oldfield	William G. Robb
Kenneth A. Jorgensen	Ferdinand Bishop
Alexander B. Swenceski	Wendell H. Duplantis
Julian F. Walters	Benjamin L. McMakin
Hoyt McMillan	Joseph R. Little, Jr.
Harry A. Schmitz	Lawrence H. McCulley
Herbert R. Amey, Jr.	Alexander A. Vandegrift, Jr.
Peter J. Negri	Edwin A. Law

To be second lieutenants

William H. Doolen	Lowell E. English
Daniel C. Pollock	George H. Cannon
Harvey B. Atkins	Robert A. Abbott
Monfurd K. Peyton	Ransom M. Wood
Lawrence V. Patterson	Bruce B. Cheever
Charles W. McCoy	Albert H. Follmar
Elmer A. Wrenn	Guy H. Kissinger, Jr.
James C. Magee, Jr.	Byron V. Leary
Jackson B. Butterfield	John P. Haines, Jr.
Edward N. Rydaldh	James R. Christensen
Robert S. Howell	Albert J. Roose
Jess P. Ferrill, Jr.	Robert F. Steidtmann
John W. Burkhardt	Alvin S. Sanders
William E. Benedict	Robert B. Chadwick
Maurice W. Fletcher	Donn J. Robertson
Raymond G. Davis	Ralph A. Collins, Jr.
George A. Graves	Edward H. Hurst
Thomas L. Ridge	Merrill M. Day
William M. Frash	Benjamin S. Hargrave, Jr.
Harold R. Warner, Jr.	Walter S. Osipoff

To be chief quartermaster clerks

Alexander N. Entringer
Samuel G. Thompson

To be chief pay clerks

Emmett G. Hall
Charles T. Gates

To be chief marine gunner

Albert S. Munsch

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Robert E. Hamilton, Eloy.
Aurelio B. Sanchez, Sonora.

KENTUCKY

Sister Basil Pike, Maple Mount.

TEXAS

Annie Koon, Buchanan Dam.
Ova Richardson, Caddo.
Frank E. Schrack, Catarina.
Ruby M. Smith, Deweyville.
Joe P. Luce, Graford.
Mary E. Cummins, Grandfalls.
Thelma L. Thames, Monroe City.
Edward H. Reinhard, Poth.
Martha Iduma McDonald, Santo.
Mary E. Featherhoff, Velasco.
Pearl B. Monke, Weinert.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with whom time and space are nothing and life in Thee is life indeed, to Thee we pray with humble hearts. For Thy name's sake consider and hear us. Awaken deeply in us the divinity that we may have uninterrupted communion with Thee. Take from us unrighteous thoughts, ignoble desires, and selfish ambitions that we may live each day with our associates in the spirit of brotherhood. Help us to so labor for our fellows that they may have life in its fullness of liberty, pursuit of happiness, in peace and dignity. He who lives right serves wisely, and he whose heart responds to the needs of man is our country's true benefactor. Heavenly Father, always enable us to preserve what is best. Persuade us, blessed Lord, that it lies in a broad charity, in wide tolerance, and in a sincere respect for the opinions of others. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I was pleased by the President's recommendations to amend the

Social Security Act. However, I wish that he had included in his recommendations a provision for the payment of compensation to permanently and totally disabled workers beginning at the date of their disability.

Under the Social Security Act at the present time a disabled worker cannot receive any compensation until he reaches the age of 65. In other words, if a married man 40 or 50 years of age becomes totally disabled, he or his family does not receive any aid whatsoever under the provisions of the present act until he reaches the age of 65, as I stated before.

I have introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act which provides that if any working person who comes under the Social Security Act becomes permanently and totally disabled, he will receive compensation beginning on the date of his disability, and that in no case shall any person coming under this amendment receive less than \$60 per month.

I hope the committee, when taking under consideration the recommendations of the President, will include my bill so as to provide compensation for permanently and totally disabled workers who at the present time cannot receive any compensation until they are 65 years of age. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point my bill (H. R. 42) to amend the Social Security Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill to which I have referred is as follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide for the payment of benefits to permanently and totally disabled individuals

Be it enacted, etc., That the title heading of title II of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—FEDERAL OLD-AGE BENEFITS AND DISABILITY BENEFITS"

Sec. 2. Such title II is amended by adding after section 202 the following new section:

"DISABILITY BENEFITS"

"Sec. 202½. (a) Every individual who becomes permanently and totally disabled shall be entitled to receive, with respect to the period beginning on the date he becomes so disabled and ending on the date of his death, a disability benefit (payable as nearly as practicable in equal monthly installments) equal to the old-age benefit he would have been entitled to receive under section 202 if he had attained the age of 65 on the date he became so disabled, but in no such case shall the monthly rate of payment be less than \$60.

"(b) Whenever the Board finds that any individual has received wages with respect to regular employment after becoming permanently and totally disabled the payments to such individual under this section shall be reduced for each calendar month in any part of which such regular employment occurred by an amount equal to 1 month's payment. Such reduction shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Board by deductions from one or more payments to such individual provided for by this section.

"(c) Benefits payable pursuant to this section shall be in lieu of any old-age benefit that would be payable to the same individual with respect to the same period."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 203 of such title II is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 203. (a) If any individual dies before attaining the age of 65 and before any benefit becomes payable to such individual under section 202½, there shall be paid to his estate an amount equal to 3½ percent of the total wages determined by the Board to have been paid to him with respect to employment after December 31, 1936.

"(b) If the Board finds that the correct amount of the benefits payable to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was less than 3½ percent of the total wages by which such benefits were measurable, then there shall be paid to his estate a sum equal to the amount, if any, by which such 3½ percent exceeds the amount (whether more or less than the correct amount) paid to him during his life under sections 202 and 202½.

"(c) If the Board finds that the total amount paid to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was less than the correct amount of the benefits to which he was entitled under such sections and that the correct amount of the benefits to which he was so entitled was 3½ percent or more of the total wages by which such benefits were measurable, then there shall be paid to his estate a sum equal to the amount, if any, by which the correct amount of the benefits payable to him under such sections exceeds the amount which was so paid to him during his life."

(b) Section 206 of such title II is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. If the Board finds that the total amount paid to an individual during his life under sections 202 and 202½ was more

than the correct amount of the benefits to which he was entitled under such sections, and was $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent or more of the total wages by which the benefits under such sections were measurable, then upon his death there shall be repaid to the United States by his estate the amount, if any, by which such total amount paid to him during his life exceeds whichever of the following is the greater: (1) Such $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent, or (2) the correct amount to which he was entitled under sections 202 and 202 $\frac{1}{2}$."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I noticed that some of the newspapers in the New England States, especially in the State of Maine, had gone out of their way to attack me on my position on the flood-control proposition.

I do not care to take up the time of the House to answer these statements from the floor, so I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein tables showing the electric-power rates paid by the people of the State of Maine.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say we are interested in having these power rates put in the RECORD, but there is hardly a day goes by that the gentleman from Mississippi does not place in the RECORD similar figures for one State or another. The gentleman has put the figures in the RECORD a half dozen times. Why fill up the RECORD by again inserting these rates?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania while he is on his feet that he is the last man on earth who ought to object.

Mr. RICH. I am trying to save the RECORD. The gentleman can put in the RECORD all the tables he wishes to, but he should not place them in the RECORD time after time after time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not trying to save the RECORD. If he were, he would not have let the long speech of the Governor of Pennsylvania go in the RECORD yesterday, and he would not have let the long speech of the Governor of Vermont go in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. It is the duty of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to keep the RECORD clean. The responsibility is not mine; it is the administration's.

Mr. RANKIN. The material I shall put in the RECORD will be clean, although it will show a very bad situation for the people of Maine who have to pay electric bills. Light and power rates in Maine are exorbitant; they are simply terrible; they are even worse than they were in Pennsylvania during the Republican administration, if such a thing is possible.

By exposing the Pennsylvania rates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have been able to force reductions of light and power rates in Pennsylvania more than \$40,000,000 a year, and it may help the situation in Maine for us to throw some light on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out a day or two ago that the real motive behind the fight against the administration's flood-control program in New England was to prevent the installation of penstocks in those dams for the development of hydroelectric power. The Power Trust does not want that done; they would rather see those dams built of solid concrete and the birthright of the people of New England in their water power destroyed for a hundred years than to see those penstocks built and generators installed that would give the people of New England a yardstick for the proper measurement of electric lights and power.

To build these dams without installing these penstocks would be a crime against the people of New England. It would be a crime against the people living there now and the ones that are to follow them for generations to come.

Nowhere in New England would the people suffer more as the result of such a policy than in the State of Maine. Maine has no coal, she has no gas, she has no oil, and her timber supply is rapidly disappearing. She must depend for her electric current upon the waters in her navigable streams and their tributaries, or upon fuel transported over long distances.

I am going to insert below the table showing the electric rates paid by the people in every city and town in Maine. In that State there are 152,000 domestic consumers of electricity. They use on an average of a little more than 40 kilowatt-hours a month, and every single one of them is overcharged more than 100 percent. Maine produces more white potatoes, or Irish potatoes, as we call them, than any other State in the Union. Yet her entire potato crop last year would not have paid the overcharges on the electric-light bills of the domestic consumers in that State. No wonder the Power Trust and all its influences are opposing the development of Quoddy project and the installation of penstocks in these flood-control dams.

In order that everyone who reads this RECORD may make his own comparisons, I am inserting below a table showing the residential rates for electricity in Ontario, Canada, just across the line from Maine, and in Tacoma, Wash., in the far West, and in the Tennessee Valley in the South.

Since the average consumption in the State of Maine is less than 50 kilowatt-hours a month, I will not run this table above 100 kilowatt-hours, in order to save space in the RECORD—which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is so anxious to conserve.

Table of comparative monthly rates—Residential service

Rates	MONTHLY CONSUMPTION		
	Kilowatt-hours		
	25	40	100
Ontario.....	\$0.75	\$1.02	\$1.74
Tacoma.....	1.13	1.52	2.12
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.75	1.20	2.50

Now compare the above rates with the rates charged in the State of Maine, as shown by the following table, and remember that Maine borders on Ontario for hundreds of miles.

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Abbot.....	250	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Acton.....	250	2.00	2.80	5.00
Addison.....	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Albion.....	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Alfred.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Andover.....	250	2.60	3.70	7.30
Anson.....	950	1.50	2.40	3.38
Ashland.....	2,100	3.00	4.60	8.60
Do.....	2,100	1.85	2.60	5.60
Athens.....	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Auburn.....	18,371	1.85	2.60	4.70
Augusta.....	17,198	1.85	2.60	4.70
Avon.....	260	2.50	3.25	5.75
Baileys Island.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bangor.....	28,749	2.00	2.75	4.70
Bar Harbor.....	4,400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Bar Mills.....	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bath.....	9,110	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belfast.....	4,993	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belgrade Depot.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Belgrade Lakes.....	304	1.85	2.60	4.70
Benton.....	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Berwick.....	1,200	2.00	2.80	5.00
Bethel.....	964	1.85	2.60	4.70
Biddeford.....	17,633	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bingham.....	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Blaine.....	500	2.50	3.25	5.50
Blue Hill.....	800	2.25	3.00	4.95
Blue Hill Falls.....	400	2.25	3.00	4.95

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Boothbay	250	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Boothbay Harbor	2,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bowdoinham	302	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bradford Center	270	2.25	3.00	4.95
Bradley	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Brewer	6,329	2.00	2.75	4.70
Bridgton	1,625	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bristol Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Brooklin	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
Brooks	450	1.85	2.60	4.70
Brownfield	705	2.50	3.25	5.63
Brownville	1,500	2.50	3.40	4.90
Brunswick	6,144	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bryant Pond	500	2.50	3.43	6.70
Buckfield	343	1.85	2.60	4.70
Bucksport	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Burnham	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Calais	5,470	1.85	2.45	4.35
Cambridge	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Camden	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Canaan	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Canton	450	1.09	2.38	4.54
Cape Elizabeth	2,365	1.85	2.60	4.70
Capital Island	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Caribou	4,000	2.25	3.00	5.40
Carmel	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Castine	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cathance	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Center Lovell	270	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cherryfield	1,000	2.25	3.00	4.95
Chesterfield	450	3.00	4.10	6.70
China	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Chisholm	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Christmas Cove	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Clinton	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Coopers Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Corinna	750	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cornish	500	2.15	3.20	5.60
Cornville	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Crescent Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Crouseville	252	2.75	3.50	5.75
Cumberland Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Cumberland Foreside	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Damariscotta	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Damariscotta Mills	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dark Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Deer Isle	386	3.50	4.55	7.75
Denmark	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Derby	300	1.50	2.40	6.00
Detroit	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dexter	3,300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dixfield	970	1.09	2.38	4.54
Dover Foxcroft	2,600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dresden Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Dryden	1,100	2.50	3.25	5.20
Eagle Lake	1,200	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,200	1.85	2.60	5.60
East Auburn	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Boothbay	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Hiram	330	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Machias	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Millinocket	1,500	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Newport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Pittston	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Sebago	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Sullivan	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
East Union	300	2.50	3.70	5.00
East Vassalboro	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
East Wilton	250	2.50	3.25	5.20
Easton	450	2.48	3.96	8.50
Do	450	1.85	2.60	5.60
Eastport	3,466	2.25	3.00	4.95
Ellsworth	3,557	2.25	3.00	4.95
Etna	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fairbanks	320	2.50	3.25	5.20
Fairfield	3,529	1.85	2.60	4.70
Falmouth	272	1.85	2.60	4.70
Falmouth Foreside	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Farmingdale	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Farmington	1,737	2.50	3.25	5.20
Farmington Falls	445	3.00	4.10	6.70
Fayette	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fort Fairfield	2,616	2.25	3.00	5.40
Fort Kent	2,245	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	2,245	1.85	2.60	5.60
Franklin	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Freedom	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Freeport	973	1.85	2.60	4.70
Frenchville	1,500	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,500	1.85	2.60	5.60
Friendship	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Fryeburg	789	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gardiner	5,609	1.85	2.60	4.70
Getchells Corner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gorham	1,083	1.85	2.60	4.70
Gouldsboro	280	2.25	3.00	4.95
Gray	350	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Great Chebeague	320	\$3.45	\$4.40	\$9.20
Greene Depot	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Greenville	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Greenville Junction	345	1.85	2.60	4.70
Guilford	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hallowell	2,675	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hampden	300	2.00	2.75	4.70
Do	300	3.00	4.20	6.60
Hampden Highlands	500	2.00	2.75	4.70
Harmony	325	1.85	2.60	4.70
Harrington	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Harrison	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hartland	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hermon Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hinckley	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hiram	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Hope	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Houlton	6,000	1.88	2.48	4.28
Howland	950	2.25	3.00	4.95
Island Falls	800	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	800	1.85	2.60	5.60
Jackman	900	3.00	4.80	6.75
Jay	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Jefferson	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Jonesboro	268	2.25	3.00	4.95
Jonesport	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
Keegan	730	1.90	2.98	5.50
Kennebunk	2,200	1.63	2.35	4.05
Kennebunk Beach	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kennebunkport	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kents Hill	350	1.85	2.60	4.70
Kezar Falls	883	2.15	3.20	5.60
Kingfield	972	2.50	3.25	5.20
Kittery	3,300	2.20	2.80	5.20
Kittery Point	1,500	2.20	2.80	5.20
Lakewood	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lebanon	629	2.00	2.80	5.00
Levant	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lewiston	34,945	1.85	2.60	4.70
Liberty	260	1.85	2.60	4.70
Limerick Mills	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Limestone	500	2.50	3.25	5.65
Lincoln	2,161	2.25	3.00	4.95
Lincoln Center	320	2.25	3.00	4.95
Lincolnton Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lisbon	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lisbon Falls	2,666	1.85	2.60	4.70
Livermore Falls	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lovell Village	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lower Gloucester	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Lubec	1,500	1.55	2.00	3.80
Machias	1,800	2.25	3.00	4.95
Machiasport	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Madawaska	1,705	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do	1,705	1.85	2.60	5.60
Madison	3,036	1.50	2.40	3.38
Manchester	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Manset	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Mars Hill	1,000	2.50	3.25	5.50
Mattawamkeag	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Mechanic Falls	1,650	1.85	2.60	4.70
Mercer	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Mexico (Ridgelyville)	4,000	1.69	2.38	4.54
Millbridge	1,000	2.25	3.00	4.95
Millford	900	2.00	2.75	4.70
Millinocket	5,350	2.25	3.00	4.95
Milo	1,600	2.50	3.40	4.90
Minot Corner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monmouth	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monroe	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monson	1,070	1.85	2.60	4.70
Monticello	1,000	2.38	3.13	5.38
Moose River	250	3.00	4.80	6.75
Mount Vernon	300	3.00	4.10	6.70
Naples	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
New Harbor	305	1.85	2.60	4.70
New Vineyard	425	2.50	3.25	5.20
Nawburg	400	3.00	4.20	6.60
Newcastle	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Newfield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Newport	1,200	1.85	2.60	4.70
Nobleboro	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Norridgewock	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Do	800	1.50	2.40	3.38
North Anson	1,121	2.50	3.50	5.75
North Berwick	1,200	2.00	2.80	5.00
North Bridgton	410	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Chesterville	270	3.00	4.10	6.70
North Deer Isle	300	3.50	4.55	7.75
North East Harbor	625	2.25	3.00	4.95
North Haven	400	2.50	3.25	5.55
North Jay	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Lubec	350	1.55	2.00	3.80
North Monmouth	495	1.85	2.60	4.70
North New Portland	570	3.00	4.50	7.00
North Vassalboro	575	1.85	2.60	4.70
North Whitefield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more.—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
North Windham	300	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Northport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Norway	2,446	1.85	2.60	4.70
Oakfield	600	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	600	1.85	2.60	5.60
Oakland	2,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Ocean Point	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Ogunquit	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Old Orchard Beach	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Old Town	7,266	2.00	2.75	4.70
Oquossoc	634	3.50	4.55	6.75
Orono	2,100	2.00	2.75	4.70
Orrs Island	450	1.85	2.60	4.70
Oxford	483	1.85	2.60	4.70
Palermo	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Palmyra	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Paris Hill	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Patten	800	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	800	1.85	2.60	5.60
Peaks Island	712	3.45	4.40	6.20
Pejepscot	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pemaquid Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pemaquid Point	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pembroke	350	2.25	3.00	4.95
Perry	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Peru	330	1.69	2.38	4.54
Phillips	734	2.50	3.25	5.75
Phippsburg	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Pittsfield	2,075	1.85	2.60	4.70
Plymouth	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Port Clyde	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Portage	516	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	516	1.85	2.60	5.60
Portland	70,810	1.85	2.60	4.70
Presque Isle	4,662	2.25	3.00	4.95
Do.	4,662	1.70	2.45	4.45
Princeton	500	3.25	4.90	8.90
Randolph	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rangeley	866	3.50	4.55	6.75
Raymond	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Readfield	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Readfield Depot	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Richmond	800	1.85	2.60	4.70
Robbinston	300	2.34	3.09	5.34
Rockland	9,075	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rockport	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Round Pond	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Rumford (Rumford Falls)	8,726	1.69	2.38	4.54
Sabbatus	900	1.85	2.60	4.70
Saco	7,233	1.85	2.60	4.70
St. Agatha	1,000	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	1,000	1.85	2.60	5.60
St. Albans	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
St. Francis	1,000	3.00	4.60	8.50
Do.	1,000	1.85	2.60	5.60
Sanford	9,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Sancerville	700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Seal Cove	600	2.25	3.00	4.95
Seal Harbor	319	2.25	3.00	4.95
Searsmont	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Searsport	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Sedgwick	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Shacomut	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Skowhegan	5,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Smithfield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Solon	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Berwick	1,800	2.00	2.80	5.00
South Brooksville	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
South Casco	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South China	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Eliot	963	2.20	2.80	5.20
South Freeport	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Gardiner	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Harpswell	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Hope	300	2.50	3.70	5.00
South Paris	1,961	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Portland	13,840	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Thomaston	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Union	250	2.50	3.70	5.00
South Waterford	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
South Windham	300	1.85	2.60	4.70
Southwest Harbor	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
Springvale	2,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Starks	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Steep Falls	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Steuben	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Stockholm	900	2.50	4.00	8.50
Do.	900	1.85	2.60	5.60
Stockton Springs	390	1.85	2.60	4.70
Stonington	800	3.50	4.55	7.75
Stratton	452	3.75	6.00	15.00
Strong	325	2.50	3.25	5.20
Surry	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Tenants Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Thomaston	1,700	1.85	2.60	4.70
Thordike	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Togus	2,350	1.85	2.60	4.70

TABLE 1.—Maine—Typical net monthly bills, Jan. 1, 1938—Residential service, communities of 250 population or more.—Con.

Community	Population	Lighting and small appliances		Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration—100 kilowatt-hours
		25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	
Topsham	800	\$1.85	\$2.60	\$4.70
Troy	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Turner Center	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Union	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Unity	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Van Buren	3,300	1.90	2.98	5.50
Vanceboro	300	4.75	7.30	17.50
Vinalhaven	1,800	2.50	3.25	5.55
Waldoboro	1,200	1.85	2.60	4.70
Warren	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Washburn	700	2.75	3.50	5.75
Waterford	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Waterville	15,454	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wayne	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Weeks Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Weld	493	2.50	3.25	5.20
Wells	500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wells Beach	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Boothbay Harbor	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Brooksville	260	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Enfield	700	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Farmington	395	2.50	3.25	5.20
West Franklin	250	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Gardiner	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Hampden	300	3.00	4.20	6.60
West Jonesport	500	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Kennebunk	719	1.63	2.35	4.05
West Lubec	300	1.55	2.00	3.80
West Paris	513	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Pembroke	350	2.25	3.00	4.95
West Scarborough	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
West Sullivan	300	2.25	3.00	4.95
Westbrook	10,807	1.85	2.60	4.70
Whitefield	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Whiting	275	1.55	2.00	3.80
Wilton	2,000	2.50	3.25	5.20
Winn	250	2.25	3.00	4.95
Winslow	3,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winslow Mills	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winter Harbor	400	2.25	3.00	4.95
Winterport	600	1.85	2.60	4.70
Winthrop	1,500	1.85	2.60	4.70
Wiscasset	750	1.85	2.60	4.70
Woodland	1,800	2.40	3.60	6.00
Woolwich	400	1.85	2.60	4.70
Yarmouth	1,000	1.85	2.60	4.70
Yarmouth Junction	250	1.85	2.60	4.70
York Beach	425	1.85	2.60	4.70
York Village	500	1.85	2.60	4.70

Who can read these high rates imposed upon the helpless consumers in the State of Maine and compare them with the rates paid just across the line in Ontario without being shocked at such a merciless exaction of exorbitant overcharges?

What we are trying to do is to secure justice for the people in that State, as well as in all other States, by bringing light and power rates down to their normal levels. The installation of these penstocks, against which selfish interests so vigorously protest, will be the greatest step yet taken in that direction.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TAX IMMUNITIES (H. DOC. NO. 113)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message of April 25, 1938, I urged that the time had come when the Congress should exercise its constitutional power to tax income from whatever source derived. I urged that the time had come when private income should not be exempt either from Federal or State income tax simply because such private income is derived as interest from Federal, State, or municipal obligations, or because it is received as compensation for services rendered to the Federal, State, or municipal Governments.

A fair and effective progressive income tax and a huge perpetual reserve of tax-exempt bonds could not exist side by side. Those who earn their livelihood from Government should bear the same tax burden as those who earn their livelihood in private employment.

The tax immunities heretofore accorded to private income derived from Government securities or Government employment are not inexorable requirements of the Constitution but are the result of judicial decision. I repeat that it is not unreasonable to hope that judicial decision would permit the elimination of these immunities.

Decisions of the Supreme Court rendered since my message, particularly the decision in the Port of New York Authority case, have made an important and constructive contribution to the elimination of these inequitable immunities.

It is obvious, however, that these inequities cannot be satisfactorily corrected by judicial decisions alone. Without legislation to supplement them, many individuals and corporations will be subjected to tax liabilities for income received in past years which they mistakenly but in good faith believed to be tax-exempt. It is evident, for example, that employees of many State agencies as well as the holders of securities of public corporations believed that the income they received from such sources was tax-exempt in view of the opinions of eminent counsel based upon earlier decisions of the Supreme Court. In the interest of equity and justice, therefore, immediate legislation is required to prevent recent judicial decisions from operating in such a retroactive fashion as to impose tax liability on those innocent employees and investors for salaries heretofore earned or on income derived from securities heretofore issued.

In the light of those decisions there are, among the taxpayers of the Nation, inevitable uncertainties respecting their tax liabilities. There is uncertainty whether the salaries which they receive are not taxable under the existing provisions of the revenue acts; there is uncertainty whether the interest which they receive upon the obligations of governmental instrumentalities is similarly not taxable; and there is an uncertainty whether the salaries and interest which they have received for past years will create an unanticipated source of tax liabilities and penalties.

In view of the fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will have no choice but to enforce our income-tax law as declared in the latest decisions of the Supreme Court, prompt legislation is necessary to safeguard against the inequities to which I have referred. The need, therefore, is for the prompt enactment of equitable rules, prospective in operation, which the Bureau can apply and taxpayers can observe without that mass of litigation which otherwise is to be anticipated. We are confronted with a situation which can be handled with fairness to all and with reasonable administrative convenience only through the cooperation of the Congress and the courts.

Unless the Congress passes some legislation dealing with this situation prior to March 15, I am informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that he will be obliged to collect back taxes for at least 3 years upon the employees of many State agencies and upon the security holders of many State corporate instrumentalities, who mistakenly but in good faith believed they were tax-exempt. The assessment and collection of these taxes will doubtlessly in many cases produce great hardship.

Accordingly, I recommend legislation to correct the existing inequitable situation, and at the same time to make private income from all Government salaries hereafter earned and from all Government securities hereafter issued subject to the general income-tax laws of the Nation and of the several States. It is difficult for almost all citizens to understand why a constitutional provision permitting taxes on "income from whatever source derived" does not mean "from whatever source derived."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TEMPORARY DETAIL OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO GOVERNMENTS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND THE PHILIPPINES (H. DOC. NO. 114)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to Governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1938, in order to obviate difficulties encountered in administering the fiscal provisions of the act.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1939.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say we are going to begin general debate in just a few moments.

Mr. REED of New York. I shall not press the point if it is not convenient. I can wait until some other time.

Mr. RAYBURN. We should like to get along with the general debate. I may say to the gentleman from New York, he knows I would hate very much to object to any request he might make, but I tried during the last session of Congress to hold down to 1 minute remarks made before the consideration of the legislative program of the day was begun.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I want the time just now is that I have some information which I believe the Members of the House may wish to study with reference to the President's message. I was just going to call the attention of the Members to another message which has some application to what was stated in the message today. However, I shall defer to the wishes of the majority leader.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Westbrook Pegler appearing on last Friday, entitled "Deep Thinking."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1939

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 5), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day, the time

to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from New York. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the debate to be confined to the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 2868 (Rept. No. 5)

A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to the widow of Allard H. Gasque, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Robert L. Bacon, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of John J. Boylan, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Stephen W. Gambrill, late a Representative from the State of Maryland, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Ben Cravens, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas, \$10,000.

The five foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: For an additional amount for national forest protection and management, including the same purposes and objects specified under this head in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939, \$500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1940, and to be expended only for the protection and management of the White Mountain National Forest, New Hampshire and Maine, including the salvaging of wind-damaged timber and restoration of experimental areas therein.

New England hurricane damage: For rehabilitation and reestablishment of forest-protection improvements, reduction of forest-fire hazards, and prevention of forest fires on State, county, municipal, and private forest lands in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut that were damaged by the hurricane of September 1938, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, fiscal year 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply in the case of any expenditure hereunder where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300: *Provided further*, That the amount allocated for expenditure in any State of the amount herein appropriated shall be available when the State to which allocation has been made shall have made or shall make available a like sum from State funds for the purposes contained herein.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: For carrying out the purposes and provisions of, and for expenditures authorized under, Public Resolution No. 91, Seventy-fifth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs," approved April 6, 1937," approved May 9, 1938 (52

Stat. 344, 1126), fiscal year 1939, to remain available until December 31, 1939, \$2,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Department of Labor—Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Wage and Hour Division in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, contract stenographic reporting services, travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, printing and binding, law books, books of reference, periodicals, manuscripts and special reports, newspapers and press clippings, supplies, office equipment, advertising, postage, telephone and telegraph service, reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, fiscal year 1939, \$850,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such agency to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Children's Bureau in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; printing and binding; supplies; equipment, newspapers, books of reference, periodicals, and press clippings; and reimbursement to State and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, as authorized by section 11 of said act, fiscal year 1939, \$79,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under the Fair Labor Standards Act when called by the Children's Bureau with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under said act when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

PROCUREMENT DIVISION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS BRANCH

Bureau of the Census Building, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.: For the acquisition of the necessary land and the construction of a building for the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, including the extension of steam and water mains, removal or diversion of such sewers and utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$3,500,000.

Sec. 2. This act may be cited as the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the deficiency bill now pending before the Committee contains six items which the Bureau of the Budget felt were very urgent and, perhaps, should not be held over until we would ordinarily bring in a deficiency bill about the middle of February. I may say that the bill and report are available if Members wish to see them.

On page 2 of the bill there are items for the payment of the usual amounts to the widows of deceased Members.

The next two items in the bill are for the United States Forest Service in consequence of the hurricane and flood which visited New England in September 1938. It will be recalled that this hurricane was of unusual ferocity and with devastating effect it swept over the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, laying waste vast areas of their fine timberlands in addition to the terrific damage that was done by flood waters.

The first item on page 2 of this bill is for \$500,000 for the National Forest Service, to augment the amount of about \$11,500,000 which they have in the current appropriation bill for such purposes, and this amount of \$500,000 is to be used in the White Mountain National Forest area for the purpose of cleaning up fallen timber, eliminating fire hazards, and reestablishing fire-prevention stations and facilities. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$700,000 for this item. The committee cut the amount to \$500,000, feeling that this amount of money, in addition to such portion of the usual

amount of \$11,500,000 which the Forest Service has for national forest protection and management, augmented further by the activities of 45 Civilian Conservation Corps camps which are operating in the storm-damaged area, and augmented further by the services of some 15,000 to 17,000 W. P. A. workers who, our New England brethren told us, in this particular instance, have performed very notable and valuable service, would be a sufficient sum to enable the Forest Service to do the fire-prevention work and other necessary tasks on the Government-owned lands, and we have brought in a report accordingly.

The next item of \$3,000,000 is practically for the same purposes but is to be used upon the privately owned lands in those States where the hurricane wrought such havoc and damage.

It was represented to our committee that something like 4,000,000,000 feet of merchantable timber was laid upon the ground by the force of this terrible storm. This is as much timber as would normally be cut and marketed in 5 years, which, at one swoop of a magic wand, as it were, was laid upon the ground, and we were told that it constitutes a fire menace and danger of major proportions. The committee could well comprehend that such a situation would be a menace to that part of the country and that it probably was of such national character as to justify the Federal Government in taking cognizance of the necessity to assist in fire-preventive measures. The Bureau of the Budget has sent in an estimate of \$5,000,000 to be used by the Forest Service on these privately owned lands toward cleaning up the devastated timber areas and restoring fire protection and prevention facilities. The committee went into the matter, we feel, very carefully. Our colleagues from New England on both sides of the aisle were kind enough to come before the committee and give us the benefit of their information and judgment and, of course, were very much interested, naturally, in seeing that appropriate and adequate relief from this condition was afforded to the territories they represented.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would rather finish a chronological statement, and then I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

We found, however, that notwithstanding the fire hazard and the menace of this condition that had existed since September 1938, little or nothing had been done by the States involved toward meeting the cost of relieving the situation. It developed that the State of Massachusetts—and I shall be pleased to be corrected if I am in error—had by legislative enactment made available something like \$19,000,000 for repairs in the flood- and hurricane-stricken area.

But a very small part, an infinitesimally small part, of that sum had been designated to be used in this method of cleaning up the fire hazards caused by this fallen timber.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told that over a million dollars was appropriated to be used on the State forest reservations, and, as the gentleman knows, we suffered terribly from the flood. Roads were damaged, our bridges were down, and there was a very bad condition of sanitation. That money had to go for that use as a matter of health protection and transportation. Will the gentleman yield further about matching dollar for dollar at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that under our State constitution Massachusetts cannot match an appropriation dollar for dollar for work in private property and lands, and a great deal of this timber is a part of the farmhouses. The timber was cut in order to build the farmhouse and for the other accessory buildings. So I am not sure that we can avail ourselves of any of the money that must be matched dollar for dollar. I am sending for the ruling by the Attorney General on that point. The Supreme Court ruled on a rather similar occasion that the State could not contribute

toward clearing or helping in respect to private lands. It is a very serious proposition for us.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is a serious proposition for all of us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is, because it affects the whole country. If the purchasing power of all New England is greatly diminished by great fires, certainly the entire country will be the loser.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the State contributions have been infinitesimal, and then he referred to what Massachusetts has bonded itself for at the special session of the legislature, and I shall talk about that more a little later, if I am permitted to do so. I have in my hand here a photostatic copy of the law passed at the extra session of the Massachusetts Legislature, and included in that \$19,000,000 were the following: Title 201-A, Forestry, \$850,000; 281-B, Forest fire service, \$123,000; 281-C, Recreations, \$90,000; 288-A, Parks, \$67,000; Enforcement of laws, \$2,678; aggregating considerably over \$1,000,000. That was direct for fire protection under this special appropriation of \$19,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I would say that the New Hampshire Legislature has not been in session since this disaster, but the Governor has just made a recommendation to the legislature, that has just gone into session, that a substantial sum of money be appropriated to take care of its part of this disaster.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I felt confident that that would be done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The only obstacle I see now is getting the consent of the Governor of Vermont. Before you can do anything in Vermont, you have to get unanimous consent nowadays.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does appear, however, that the only financial aid rendered by any State involved in this tragedy is the \$1,000,000 of the \$19,000,000 appropriated by the State of Massachusetts. So far as the committee knows, no other State involved has made available any funds for this purpose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I interrupt again at this point to state that, as the gentleman knows, the President sent on a great many people from the forestry and the W. P. A. and various Government agencies, and there was a general feeling that a great deal of money would be given to the States for rehabilitation work. That may be one reason why the other States did not contribute—through a misunderstanding.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Whatever the reason may be, the fact remains that they have not taken cognizance of the fact that what they recommend to the Congress is a serious menace—and I do not underestimate that it is a menace—they have taken no action themselves to ameliorate it. I do not see why the Federal Government should bear the major portion of the cost of cleaning the situation up.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There has never been such a hurricane, such disaster, and such danger to timberlands before.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, let me say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts that there have been many national tragedies, even in my experience here of 16 years, and almost without exception the action that Con-

gress has taken has been to make available loans to the areas affected. Those loans in many cases were almost without security, but at least they went through the form of loans, for the very reason that the Congress as a national legislature is affected by the same ethical and theoretical conditions that the gentlewoman finds affect her own State. We have no right theoretically to appropriate money to be used on private lands.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the fire hazard is so extremely great in Massachusetts alone, where 531 lives to the square mile are endangered by this fire hazard. It is an emergency; this is not a regular appropriation and must be made immediately if it is to serve its purpose. The threat of fire is even more serious than the hurricane.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I quite agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and the committee agrees. Otherwise we would not be recommending \$3,000,000 of Federal Government money to meet this situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the people live 531 to the square mile, as the lady from Massachusetts says, they ought to be able to put out any fire.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Are we laying down a policy that will come back to plague us in the future, that whenever we have some disaster, due to an act of God, the Congress of the United States will be called upon to rehabilitate the area?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman, as he well knows, the Congress has responded on many occasions to relieve suffering in the drought areas in Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida and other States, but they were loans in most cases by or through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many of them have been repaid.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this a loan or an outright gift?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is an outright gift.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, there is a difference between the two even though you require the States in this instance to match the Government contribution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course there is a difference, but the evidence before our committee was to the effect that it had been such a terrific blow to this section of the country, not only this section but to the individuals involved, that we felt the Federal Government, through the Forest Service, might have a substantial part in cleaning it up.

Mr. COCHRAN. Another question. Does not the gentleman feel there should be some limitation placed upon the amount you are going to spend in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not provide for any of it to be spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, yes; in the bill you provide that part of it can be spent in the District of Columbia even for printing and binding and also for automobiles. Now, the District of Columbia was not affected by the hurricane. You are liable to have a lot of employees in the District of Columbia getting a lot of this money that should go to this area. The Forest Service should be able to handle this without additional personnel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I should be willing for the gentleman from Missouri to draw an amendment. I am sure the committee has no objection to a reasonable limitation. Of necessity, there will be some departmental expense in administering this money, but I would have no objection to any reasonable limitation that the gentleman feels should go in here.

Mr. COCHRAN. This has come so fast that I have no information about the project at all. The bill has just come in and the hearings released only an hour ago. Those who heard the testimony should be able to draw an amendment which provides for a limitation, or better still, one that would prevent any of the money being used in the District

of Columbia. Let them get along with their present force here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood that the Congress gave an outright grant to the city of Chicago at the time of the great fire, and to California at the time of the earthquake and fire in San Francisco. So there is a precedent for this. This country has given grants to foreign countries in supplies to care for distressed people.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That may be true.

Now, the next item in the bill is an item for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, for the control of various insects—Mormon crickets, chinch bugs, various kinds of grasshoppers and other pests that come along to pester people and crops.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Bureau of Entomology, as I understand, recommended to the Budget \$6,000,000 to take care of these pests. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$3,300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not had a chance to read the record. Has the gentleman ever seen these grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and so forth, in action? They are about as long as the old crawfish we used to see in the swamps. Has the gentleman ever seen these things in action?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; but I have heard they are quite active.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They are very active. They will go into a field of wheat in the morning, and usually it is destroyed by nighttime. Of course, I do not know who the other members of the committee are, but I am taking your word for it that you never saw these bugs in action. Does not the gentleman think that the department that has to do with the carrying on of this work, together with the aid of the farmers who actually do the work in the spreading of this bait, and so forth, ought to know more about what would be necessary to conduct this campaign against these pests than we Members sitting down here who really do not know much about it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Ordinarily, it would seem that they would, but actually they do not. I say that for this reason: They have come before our committee on more than one occasion with an estimate for pest control in excess of what the committee felt was justified. The committee cut their estimates, and our friends hollered blue murder. They had just been ruined. They envisioned the grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, chinch bugs, and other bugs just carrying the country away. They were just ruined. Yet they were not able to spend the appropriations we provided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know the gentleman is going to say they did not get the money as soon as they should. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will call the gentleman's attention to another thing. I get this from the Bureau of Entomology in Washington. They tell me that in Montana those bugs, grasshoppers, and crickets were eradicated early in the spring and then they migrated, later on, from the State of North Dakota into Montana, and I have these figures from the Bureau of Entomology. As the result of their invading the State of Montana later on in the spring, crops to the value of \$6,000,000 were destroyed by them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is the point to the thing: There is no doubt this Department will not spend any money that is not necessary to carry on this campaign. Let us give them sufficient at this time to prevent just such occurrences as have been outlined to the gentleman by the Bureau here in Washington.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They did a very good job last year in controlling it. No effort, apparently, is being

made to exterminate these insect pests. The Bureau of Entomology and the Department of Agriculture have thrown up their hands, seemingly. They do not know what to do. About all they can do is to fight them when they put in an appearance. Last year they did a very good job with \$2,000,000 and did not get it nearly as soon as we are making it available to them this year. We are giving them the same amount they got last year and giving it to them very much earlier. They will have available \$2,700,000, which ought to be ample.

The next item is for the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That act was passed very late in the last session of Congress. An amount of \$400,000 was made available. The Administrator has set up the organization. They are operating, they are trying to meet the terrific duty imposed upon the Department of Labor in the construction and control of this new law affecting every State in the Union and every business and every industry to some extent.

We went into the matter very carefully. The Budget estimate of \$950,000 the committee cut to \$850,000, not with the idea of trying to throw any impediment in the way of a fair enforcement of this act and a fair trial for it but upon the statement of the Administrator that all of the personnel had to come from civil service. Many examinations have to be held to recruit his staff, and we felt that the slight cut made by the committee would be evidence of the committee's hope and of the hope of the Congress that he would move cautiously.

We were very much encouraged to hear from Mr. Andrews the statement that in traveling over the country and contacting many business and industrial leaders who had been very antagonistic to the suggestion of the passage of such a law and who had opposed it in every way they could, that they now show almost universally a fine spirit of co-operation and intention to try it out, put it into operation in their plants, and endeavor to make it work. Almost invariably, however, they impressed upon the Administrator the fact that if the law is ever to be a success, in order to be fair to those who are trying to observe it, the administration should enforce it against those who are inclined to disobey it. The committee did not feel that the Congress should be too drastic in curtailing a new agency of such wide scope and character as the wage and hour division, and I do not believe we have.

The last item in the bill is for the purpose of erecting a Census Bureau building. When the matter was first suggested to me, that we were being called upon to build another Government building in Washington, I was antagonistic to the idea. We went into the matter very carefully and we found that in the District of Columbia, Government agencies are now housed in 120 buildings other than Government-owned buildings. Twenty-two thousand employees of the Government are employed in these privately owned buildings. The rental bill that we are paying to the landlords of Washington is \$3,500,000. The Department of Agriculture is housed in 29 different buildings and pays \$468,000 a year rent. The Department of the Interior, although we just built a handsome new building for it, is housed in 11 different buildings and is paying \$236,000 a year rent. The Treasury Department is in 16 different buildings. Government agencies, as I say, are in 120 different privately owned buildings in Washington and are paying \$3,500,000 rent.

We are faced with the fact that we must take the decennial census. In order to take the census the Bureau of the Census will have to augment its normal personnel of about 700 to a personnel of about 7,500 in the District of Columbia for 6 or 8 months.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

There will be housed in this building in the District of Columbia the 7,500 people who will take this census. They all come from civil-service rolls. They are temporary employees. There is no space in the District of Columbia that can be gotten to house this activity. The only other alterna-

tive would be to have some private individual or agency put up a building. Bids were solicited from such sources, and the best offer received was for a building way out on the outskirts of Washington where transportation would be difficult, and at a rental of something like \$400,000 a year.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would this building that it is proposed to build house 7,500 for 6 months in the 10-year period and then only 700 during the other nine and a half years?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am coming to that, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I notice an item for New Hampshire and Maine. I was of the opinion that New Hampshire and Maine did not want any relief from the Federal Government.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We had a pretty full discussion of that matter, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARTON. Does the gentleman think it would be in order to abolish some of these bureaus, such as the National Emergency Council and the Guffey Coal Commission, to make room for the Census Bureau?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is very much in order to abolish some of the commissions, I may say to the gentleman; but when you look over the list of agencies that are housed in rented buildings, the gentleman will find he raises a very difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is not any peculiar condition that has existed for only the last 6 years. Since I have been here, a total of 16 years, the Government has had a terrific rent bill. The Government has always paid for outside space and has never had sufficient room in the public buildings in Washington, even when my friend's party was in power. There were more bureaus and agencies in Washington at that time than the Federal Government had buildings in which to house them.

Mr. BARTON. Does the gentleman know how many buildings have been built under this administration to house these new bureaus?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. A great many buildings, but the majority of the fine building program in the District of Columbia can be taken credit for by my friend's party. The first great building that was put up was the palace for the Department of Commerce, with the noted gold-plate dishes for the Secretary of Commerce, as my friend will remember, the shower bath, the private elevator, and what not.

That was the first palace that Mr. Hoover built. All of the string of buildings along Constitution Avenue was started under the administration of the gentleman's party, and the gentleman's party can take credit for them because this is the greatest nation in the world and we should have a government housed commensurate with its dignity. I favor that, and I am sure the gentleman does.

Mr. BARTON. When Mr. Hoover was putting up that building, does the gentleman recall what the national deficit was as compared with the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, there was a deficit, and there has been a deficit right along. The gentleman and I understand that.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, when those buildings were authorized, the national debt was being reduced at a great rate. This Congress passed bills reducing the debt at the rate of a billion dollars a year. There was no deficit. These buildings were authorized in the prosperous

days, but many of them have been built in the depression days.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a long story. History will tell the story in full.

Mr. MICHENER. But is that not so?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not want to get into that. The question now is, Shall we build the Census Building that is needed? This type of building is badly needed by the departments in Washington. Answering specifically my friend's question, when the census is completed and the normal personnel of the Bureau of the Census drops back to 700 or so, one of two things will happen; either there will be brought in some of these agencies that are housed now in rented quarters or else do what should be done—that is, put into the building a great many of the inactive files of some of these departments that now occupy high-priced rental space in other buildings, files that do not come within the category of records that should be put in the Archives Building and yet should not be destroyed. The building is needed for the regular, normal activities of the Government. Even if our dreams and hopes for restriction of unnecessary agencies should mature, we could not hope to vacate all of these 120 buildings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice the report states that the building will be of the brick and sandstone type. If that building is located near Constitution Avenue, does the gentleman think that would mar the beauty of Constitution Avenue and the buildings located thereon?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not to be located in that group of monumental buildings on Constitution Avenue. It is to be well back of the Mall and will be of the same type as the building occupied by the Procurement Division, a very substantial one—will involve a construction cost of about \$9 per square foot. It is a utilitarian type of building.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman does not think the location of this type of building here will mar that locality?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the building will be well removed from the locality the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak solely of the one item involving disaster from the recent hurricane in New England, and I would like to give a brief description of my own personal experience in that flood and hurricane.

On the morning of September 21 last year I endeavored to drive from my home in western Massachusetts to Springfield, where I had a scheduled meeting, not a political one, purely business. I found that following 3 or 4 days of constant, steady rain the roads were practically impassible. I therefore drove a few miles and took a train from Pittsfield to Springfield, which was one of the last trains to operate over the Boston & Albany Railroad for quite a period of time. Following the meeting I attended in Springfield I had occasion to go to Holyoke, which is the largest city in my district. A friend had driven the 11 miles from Holyoke to Springfield to meet me. At that time it was raining terrifically hard, and my friend drove down through the rain. About 4:30 in the afternoon, following the business meeting I was attending, one of my friends came out of the building where we had held the meeting and said the radio had announced a hurricane was coming up the New England coast. This was the first intimation of the possibility of the hurricane's visiting that area. Another friend came from the same meeting and said, "My wife is driving home from down in Connecticut and I am worried about her on account of the rain." The suddenness of this catastrophe can be shown by the fact that the next morning I picked up a newspaper and read that the wife of this friend had been drowned in an effort to get back to Springfield that afternoon.

LXXXIV—33

What I have said so far has to do with the rain, which continued for quite a few days, but at half past four in the afternoon when I left Springfield for Holyoke the wind started. We were 2 hours covering the 11 miles between those two cities, over a good State highway which in ordinary circumstances one could travel in 20 minutes. I got to the point where fear no longer existed for me because the feeling of helplessness came over one so strongly. Trees were coming down all over the road, wires were being thrown down, and automobiles were being hit. One did not know from 1 minute to another whether the next tree was going to fall on the car one happened to be in or fall down beside the road. Through the skillful driving of my friend I was able to get to Holyoke in about 2 hours. This gives you just a word picture of the terrible suddenness of this storm.

The hurricane followed the flood. We were therefore doubly afflicted, first by the tremendous flood and second by the hurricane.

The first preparation for recovery had to do with the flood. Entire towns were inundated. Roads were absolutely washed out in entire communities. The events of which I have been speaking occurred on a Wednesday afternoon. On the following Saturday I attended a meeting of representatives of the towns of Franklin County, Mass., all of which are in my district. The county commissioners were endeavoring to appease the citizens of these small communities, telling them what they could do for them and what they would do for them. People in large areas there were endeavoring to get milk to the market daily, and were finding fault because they could not get their milk to market. The chairman of the county commissioners said, "Suppose we could send a team up into that town instead of trying to get down there by automobile truck, would that be all right? Could we not send you a team to get the milk down to market?" "Why, Mr. Commissioner," was the reply, "a goat could not travel over a single road in the town."

Where a goat could not go certainly there were not many transportation facilities.

Following this tremendous storm I made a trip to Washington: purposely to see some of the officials. They were extremely courteous and very much interested in the story of the flood conditions. However, that action had to do with the clearing up at that particular time.

Certain towns in my district were absolutely put out of business. No industry survived this awful flood. I could take all the time allotted to me in telling you of that situation, but what you are interested in today is the hurricane situation, so I wish to pass on to the hurricane feature of the existing situation. I say "existing" because the result of it still exists right there.

We found the Forest Service eager to cooperate in every way possible, and they have been continuing to do so. I read in the report which has just been issued by the Committee on Appropriations certain very significant statements, which I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] for making as they certainly aid our case tremendously. For instance, the report states:

The evidence is indisputable as to the urgent need of freeing the wooded areas—some 8,000,000 acres, through which the storm passed—of great quantities of inflammable debris, constituting a serious fire hazard, in many cases adjacent to thickly populated communities.

In another place the report states:

The Congress has, in the case of a number of past catastrophes, responded with Federal financial aid.

I have here a long list, and I am sorry it is not carried up to the present time, of instances of aid the Federal Government has rendered when catastrophes have occurred, even in Italy. There is an item here of Congress appropriating \$800,000 for procurement and distribution of provisions, clothing, medicines, and so forth, for the suffering and destitute people of Italy as a result of the Messina earthquake. Many of the items in the list I hold in my hand refer to loans, so-called, but of course not repaid and not expected to be

repaid. For instance, reference is made to the fire in San Francisco, and to the appropriation of \$100,000,000 as a revolving fund to furnish foodstuffs to the populations of Europe following the war. Here is an item of \$1,775,000 for Army stores for the relief of sufferers from fire at Astoria, Oreg.

As I see it, no greater calamity ever happened than what has happened to New England at the present time, so why should there be any anxiety at the present time over the size of the appropriation to be made by the Congress to relieve this terrible situation?

I particularly call the attention of the Members of the House to this map. It is a map of New England. The pink area here is where the hurricane hit. The hurricane came up from Long Island Sound on the afternoon of which I have spoken, and about half past 4 in the afternoon it started and went directly up through that entire area, hitting sections in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and a small section of Maine.

Every New England State was directly affected, and there is timber down in this whole area.

Now, look at these pictures which I have here from the Forest Service, every one of them showing down timber. While this picture I have here is small and not very easy for the Members of the House to see, yet here is a very typical picture of the down timber surrounding a farmhouse, and unless this slash is cleaned up and removed by spring, even though the logs are taken out of there, is there a chance in the world for the inhabitants of this house to be able to save that property? Fire is inevitable.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will yield to the gentleman, but I must finish my statement on the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. I simply wanted to call attention to the fire hazard involved there.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am coming to that very feature, and that is exactly what I meant when I asked if there was a chance for the inhabitants of this place to survive.

These other pictures I have here are quite similar. This particular picture happens to be on a State forest in New Hampshire. I simply wish the House to see the condition in that area, which is duplicated everywhere. Here are logs, which, of course, are perhaps merchantable and marketable, but when you go in and clean up by just taking out the logs, naturally, you are leaving all this slash and there is a fire hazard of tremendous proportions.

What the Forest Service did was to endeavor to make contracts with the owners of private property to take out their merchantable timber.

Let me give you a word of illustration about that. I attended a meeting just before Congress opened. I was asked to come up to a town in my district to meet the owners of down timber. I went to that meeting and met 60 men and women whose entire source of income or entire property was flat on the ground. They did not have a dollar with which to market this timber or to continue carrying on their work as ordinary farmers. There were 60 of these people and I am going to speak of them, as well as the entire Massachusetts picture, a little later, but I want to cover particularly the New England situation as we who are in New England see it.

I am a Massachusetts man, interested in Massachusetts as such, and interested in these constituents of mine that I am telling you about who are suffering so as a result of this existing situation, and appealing to you in their behalf, but the picture is bigger than any one State, Mr. Chairman, the picture is a New England picture as shown by this map.

Now, the Forest Service estimates there are 14,000,000 acres in the hurricane area; that is 14,000,000 in this pink section of the map, and there are 150,000 acres of down timber on which there are from three and a half to four billion feet. The Forest Service has made 2,000 contracts covering 400,000,000 feet already. The method of contracting is this. The Forest Service has graded this timber into three classes,

1, 2, and 3, of which they estimate that class 1 is about 5 percent. On that they will pay \$18 per thousand feet at a mill or at a pond. The next classification is at \$14 a thousand and this they estimate at about 40 percent. The other 55 percent is in the third classification at \$12. This \$12 means that under the Disaster Loan Corporation there will be paid to those log owners at a pond or at a mill, no matter how inaccessible it may be, or how impossible it may be for the lot owner to get his timber to these places, \$12 per thousand feet in the log, less 10 percent; in other words, it will amount to \$10.80 only.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman very briefly, because I have a long picture to paint.

Mr. HARE. I am just wondering whether the price designated by the gentleman refers to sawed timber or is the price in the log.

Mr. TREADWAY. In the log.

Mr. HARE. A pretty high price.

Mr. TREADWAY. Not a sufficient price to encourage the owners to market the logs or return a new dollar for an old one.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. When they have forest fires in the State of Washington, the Government does not pay the people out there for the damage, and I do not see why they should pay for these damages which they have sustained from forest fires in New England.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know about other fires, although I do know that Oregon has been paid in a similar case.

I have here another picture of the same situation I have been describing, and these pictures are available if any Members care to see them in more detail.

After these 2,000 contracts are made, and we hope the number will be materially increased, you will still have this terrible fire hazard; and unless this fire hazard is removed by early spring, just as soon as this slash begins to dry out, no one can conceive of the probable damage that will happen in the way of fires.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Are not the C. C. C. now engaged in clearing away that brush?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; they are doing as good a job as it is possible to do, and I shall be very glad to quote a reference from the Forest Service that I have of the work that they are doing; but there are not enough of them, nor of the W. P. A.

Mr. HEALEY. Their work is also on private property?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. Where there may be a fire hazard.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; and perhaps it might be well, as long as the gentleman is referring to private property, for me to bring up the situation in Massachusetts, as regards the item in the bill before us, namely, the matter of matching dollar for dollar. I have a telegram that I received last evening from the Governor of Massachusetts, which reads as follows:

HON. ALLEN TREADWAY,

House of Representatives:

Over \$1,000,000 appropriated at special session of Massachusetts Legislature, October 1938, to remove fire hazard in timberlands owned by Commonwealth, including farms, reservation areas, and State forests. Appropriation for privately owned timberlands not permitted under State constitution. Fallen timber in this State estimated at one and one-half to two billion board feet, including four million in State-owned properties. Removal cost estimate, \$3,000,000. Approximately 9,000 C. C. C. and W. P. A. workers employed removing hazard from privately owned areas under easements. Doubt that Massachusetts can participate on dollar-matching program on privately owned properties.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Therefore, we cannot match dollar for dollar, as I see it, because we are prohibited under the State constitution from using the State funds on private lands. The telegram of

the Governor explains the situation as far as Massachusetts is concerned in connection with the item in the bill under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to proceed, but I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any information as to the probability of these devastated lands being reforested by nature?

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, let us get over the catastrophe before we begin to find out what we will do in the future.

Mr. KNUTSON. The reason I asked that question is this. It is a fire hazard at the present time and if that hazard is not cleared up and there should be a severe fire, it would retard reforestation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with the gentleman that perhaps we ought eventually to reforest it, but let us clean it up first so that we can reforest it.

I take occasion at this moment to speak most highly of both the Forester, Mr. Silcox, and his assistant, Mr. Tinker, and the cooperation they have endeavored to give us in Massachusetts, but there are not ample funds available at the present time, nor is there any possibility of our securing them unless it is by direct appropriation. I have a memorandum here from the Forest Service to which I have already referred, and I shall read the reference that he makes in this statement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is a fact, is it not, that the total recommended by the Forest Service for six New England States, broken down by States, amounts to approximately \$8,000,000?

Mr. TREADWAY. The original request of the Forest Service was for \$8,000,000 for use in the States, and then I think \$870,000 for the national forest in New Hampshire, but that was cut down by the Budget from \$8,000,000 to \$5,000,000 and by the committee to \$3,000,000. The telegram from the Governor says that it would require \$3,000,000 in Massachusetts alone to clean up the fire hazard.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And still leave the emergency features of the work.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; absolutely. I call the attention of the House now to this memorandum which I received from Mr. Tinker, the assistant forester:

MEMORANDUM TO MR. TREADWAY

1. When the Forest Service was precipitated into the hurricane disaster work in New England by order of the President the State conservation agencies were called into consultation in Boston and a definite plan of hazard elimination developed and agreed upon. State projects, involving the use of available W. P. A. facilities, were submitted and acted upon immediately. These resulted in 15,000 to 17,000 men being employed on hazard-elimination work, a totally inadequate number, but the maximum that could be utilized in areas accessible to the sources of supply of labor. All of the C. C. C. camps administered by the Forest Service, State agencies, and the Park Service were turned over to the coordinating agency and their efforts directed toward hazard elimination.

2. Realizing the necessity for proper supervision and direction, the Forest Service drew upon its resources of experienced personnel, established an office in Boston to assume direct responsibility for the operations, and employed field technicians through the W. P. A. to exercise technical direction over the hazard-elimination operations and to inventory the extent of the damage, the hazard, and the requirements to meet the catastrophe.

3. As a result of the action taken, an integrated program of hazard elimination has been developed in cooperation with the State agencies, and something over 20,000 men have expended their efforts in an attempt to reduce the hazard to normal. This program has required planning, organization work on a tremendous scale, and constant supervision. It could have been accomplished in no other way than through the detail of experienced Forest Service personnel to the job. It can be carried on in no other way. The State agencies were totally unprepared to cope with a disaster of such proportions.

4. The hurricane damage in New England was not confined to ruined forests. There was a tremendous loss of property of all kinds, and the States were overwhelmed in their attempt to repair the effects of wind and flood. Towns utilized all possible labor in clearing away debris, in repairing sewer and water systems. The burden of men and money fell heavily on towns and States.

5. The fire-hazard reduction work being directed by the Forest Service covers some 600 towns in the stricken area. In nearly all of these towns committees have been organized and have been occupied with aiding in the fire-hazard reduction, giving of their time and money freely.

6. In Mr. Tinker's memorandum to you dated December 22 he wrote as follows:

"The fire-hazard reduction work has proceeded under severe limitations. Unfortunately, W. P. A. has not been able to furnish us anything like the required number of men. The estimated force required was 39,000, whereas at the peak in late November only 18,000 men were obtained. Fire-hazard conditions in New England as they will exist next spring cannot be exaggerated. To anyone who has been in the disaster area the thought of the possibilities of a disaster even greater than the hurricane is appalling. The timber-salvage work this winter will appreciably reduce the fire hazard, but in spite of this, under the limitations that now exist in elimination work, the situation next spring will represent a very real menace to the public safety."

"If the above-enumerated measures are not taken and fires are not adequately handled during the coming spring fire season, I predict there will be loss of life and property throughout the path of this hurricane equal and even beyond that done by the storm itself. I feel a tremendous responsibility in all these undertakings and feel that all influential and thinking people should be properly apprised of the exact situation and then prepare to prevent these things from happening."

7. The Forest Service estimates that there is a gross area affected by the hurricane of about 14,000,000 acres in the New England States needing protection, with about 150,000 acres of blown-down timber where intensive fire-hazard reduction work over a period of almost 2 years will be needed to reduce the hazard to normal. There are about 1,200 miles of roads to be opened and about 950 miles of telephone lines and five lookout towers to be constructed.

To make possible quick action for fire suppression it will be necessary to organize, in conjunction with the States, fire-suppression and fire-fighting crews to be ready to act expeditiously. The necessary fire-fighting equipment must be purchased and located at strategic points throughout the area and the organized crews instructed in the use of this equipment. All of this organization is for protective purposes while the work of removing the blown-down timber is being carried on. Our minimum plan calls for about 7,500 temporary employees to carry on fire-hazard reduction. This force includes patrolmen, foremen, straw bosses, and about 5,800 laborers. This force is in addition to the C. C. C. camps and whatever W. P. A. labor can be secured for use in areas accessible to such labor.

Now, as to precedents for this sort of an appropriation, the very next item in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is for relief from grasshoppers—an item where the Federal Government is to aid people who have grasshoppers on their property. Well, I cannot conceive of grasshoppers being as serious a menace to anybody's property as such a fire hazard as I am showing the pictures of here today. I have been along the highways in my own district and they are in no way other than correct representations even for miles in extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have a little memorandum here of where the Federal Government has aided in other lines to relieve distress and troubles: The foot-and-mouth disease, cattle tick, grasshoppers, tuberculosis in cattle, contagious abortions, Mediterranean fruitfly, corn borer, boll weevil, stem rust. All those things have to do with agricultural situations, and this situation I am describing has just as much to do with agriculture, because these people who own this down timber are practically all farmers. They are not simply timber owners but their actual assets are all lying flat on the ground today. It certainly is not an unreasonable appeal that we are making to the Federal Government to relieve this distressed situation in New England. I cannot conceive of a reduction being made by the Appropriations Committee. If Mr. Silcox and his department, or we, as the representatives of this affected area, fail in our duty to the committee in providing the necessary information on which to base its decision to give sufficient money for this purpose, let us have an opportunity of supplying that information at some further hearing.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fair statement to say that the fire hazard of which the gentleman speaks extends to towns and cities and entire communities in the New England States?

Mr. TREADWAY. The memorandum which the Forest Service gave me, which I will extend in the RECORD, shows how worried they are that this fire hazard will just sweep New England. It is just as likely to start at Long Island Sound and go right through this whole area as did the hurricane originally. The number of industries, cities, communities and people endangered—the number of deaths that will result from such a calamity are inestimable. I cannot conceive of cutting down an appropriation where humanitarian work is as much required as it is here.

I do not know how this \$3,000,000 is broken down and what part of it is going to Massachusetts, but Massachusetts alone would need more than that amount, in accordance with the word I have from the Governor. But we are not going to argue about allotting this entire sum to Massachusetts alone. It is a New England problem, and the appropriation ought to be made sufficient to cover New England. I am not familiar with the statutes of other States, but if we cannot, under our State constitution, match dollar for dollar, it is unfair, it seems to me, to make that a condition under which any money will be given to Massachusetts by the Federal Government. I feel very strongly that at least that feature ought to be eliminated, and let Members from other States quote what the laws and constitutions may be in their respective States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told by Members that the laws in certain States may not allow them to contribute. They probably can only contribute a small amount in any event.

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not feel qualified to speak for other States. I am speaking for New England as a whole, anxious to see this disaster condition removed from New England as a whole. But I do feel that we in Massachusetts ought to have special consideration in view of the constitutional provision to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to emphasize the fact that the bill before the committee today is not concerned with the purchase of timber, but confines itself only to the fire hazard.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that, because he and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I all have similar bills asking for additional money for the purchase of this timber. That has nothing to do with the question under consideration at this time. We are discussing only the fire hazard and the fire possibilities of the future in today's appeal to Congress.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Does the gentleman think that even the amount recommended in this bill is sufficient to do that?

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, it would not cover Massachusetts alone, but we have to divide it up, in fairness to the other States and our hope in the fairness of Congress to make an additional appropriation for all of us.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it not true that unless this fire menace is cleared up the tremendous investment the Federal Government now has in the White Mountain National Forest will be jeopardized by any forest fires that might start?

Mr. TREADWAY. I may say further that every bit of this money will be used for labor. It is to be used for nothing except cleaning up this slash and fire hazard. The question of unemployment, therefore, is vitally involved also. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to congratulate the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the early action it has taken with reference to dealing with a subject that is of prime importance to us in the territory I represent, namely, eastern Montana.

So that you will have some sort of picture in mind as to this territory, I may say that we have large farm units, great grazing territories on which no human being lives. These areas are so vast that it is difficult to deal with them effectively when the grasshoppers become promiscuous. Attention must be given to these pests early in the season to be effective.

A few dollars spent early in the spring will accomplish much more than perhaps five times that amount spent later. We are already receiving warnings as to what is going on in eastern Montana. I shall read from an Associated Press dispatch from Broadus, Mont., the Powder River country—and I think everybody here has heard of Powder River.

I wish to insert the following Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Billings Gazette, Billings, Mont., on January 14:

BROADUS, January 14.—Ranchers in Powder River County have started their 1939 Mormon cricket worries.

Mild weather caused an early hatching of the destructive pests, and Guy Nash, rancher, living 9 miles west of here, declared he could "collect tubs full" of them if his word was doubted.

Ranchers hope the early hatched crickets will be caught in an expected cold wave and destroyed.

If that does not happen, namely, cold weather sets in, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be a mighty serious problem in this territory. I wish to say to those of you who have not seen Mormon crickets and are not familiar with them that they are a mighty destructive cannibalistic insect, or whatever you call them. It would remind you of the old craw-daddy that we as children used to see in the swamps along the Missouri River. They are so ferocious that Indian legend has it that the Mormon cricket is the reincarnation of the buffalo returning to vent its wrath for the wholesale slaughter of the buffalo decades ago. You will recall, as history tells us, the infestation of the Mormon crickets on lands cultivated by the Mormons in Utah in such numbers that destruction of their crops was imminent. You will recall also that history informs us that the sea gull, the sacred bird of the Mormons, gorged itself with these crickets in the fields and then carried them to the middle of what is known as Great Salt Lake and there disgorged them, returning to the field to repeat the operation. That is why today we have a statue of a sea gull in Salt Lake City commemorating its service to humanity. In order that you may have some idea of how the campaign of destruction on these pests works, the Government buys the bait, sends it to each county. There it is mixed and the farmers come and take the bait and distribute it where it will do the most good. As a matter of fact, the State and the farmers perhaps equally match in work and money the amount expended by the Federal Government.

I wish to insert, at this point, a telegram received by me from H. B. Mills, Montana State entomologist, as follows:

Have information for Montana only. Seven thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven tons bait needed for crops compared with 5,018 last year. Further need 6,280 tons for idle land and 8,824 for range, total 19,241. Increase 14,223, or 300 percent necessary to expand program to reduce possibility of vast migrations which cost Montana over six million last year. Cannot adequately plan for campaign unless total needed available in advance of season. Lee A. Strong, Chief, Bureau of Entomology, in Washington can give you picture of general situation.

And I got in touch with Dr. Strong, and he did.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. What percentage of the money appropriated by Congress is spent for this bait the gentleman speaks of? Is it not largely spent for bait?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Practically all of the money Congress appropriates is spent for bait with the exception of what is used for the construction of miles of tin barriers to prevent the crickets crawling on uninfested areas. The cost of transportation and distribution is borne by the farmers.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. In other words, then, the localities themselves are contributing at least as much as the Federal Government toward the eradication of this pest?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is virtually correct when we consider the help furnished by the State and the cash contributions or work done by the farmers and the transportation of the bait to the place of intended use.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. If the statement made by the gentleman is correct, then, perhaps, instead of \$2,000,000, the proper figure would be nearer \$6,000,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would be. The Bureau of Entomology, which makes a study of these matters, which has to do with the expending of this fund, recommended to the Bureau of the Budget the sum of \$6,000,000. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in turn, recommended to Congress the appropriation of \$3,300,000.

This recommendation was made in view of the fact, I understand, that some \$700,000 was left over from the amount appropriated last year. Congress does not need to be afraid of appropriating this sum, for it will not be spent unless emergency condition makes it necessary. The very fact that there was a carry-over from last year shows how carefully the fund is administered.

We have heard much talk about different menaces here this morning, and I do not want to mitigate anything the gentleman from Massachusetts has said about fire hazard, because we have seen fire in Montana, and too, we have seen the C. C. C. boys, without fear, disregarding the danger to their lives, and in many instances losing their lives, fight their way into the mountainous regions to extinguish, in a short time, a conflagration which was raging in our virgin forests.

When, however, it comes down to real injury and damage, the pests I am talking about, the grasshoppers, are the real menace to the agriculturist and they destroy vegetation and crops. They rise in clouds so thick as virtually to obscure the rays of the sun. They light in a field in the morning, and by nightfall it is stripped of its grain, and all vegetation.

These Mormon crickets, my friends, are worse than grasshoppers. I do not know whether they come from the Mormon territory or not, but wherever they come from they are a serious menace. I may say I never saw them in Montana until the last few years and they absolutely destroy everything they touch, not only crops, but garments, fence posts, and so forth.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What makes the gentleman think the crickets are more destructive than the grasshoppers?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Because they are larger. Has my friend ever seen a Mormon cricket?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has the gentleman ever seen an old-fashioned craw-daddy in the swamps?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With those long tentacles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I fully realize the destructiveness of the grasshoppers and the crickets, and though I have not seen the crickets, I have heard them discussed on the floor of this House and elsewhere and have read up on the subject; and I know that crickets really do more damage than grasshoppers do, as they are larger, move more slowly, and destroy more thoroughly. Does not the gentleman think that the amount recommended by the Department, namely, \$6,000,000, should be restored in this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should think so. I am going to propose an amendment which I think the House should seriously consider.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman; crickets and grasshoppers are extremely destructive.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have the figures on the amount of money used for the destruction of the grasshoppers and crickets in each State. In Montana \$12,519 of Federal funds were used for destroying grasshoppers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Was that not entirely inadequate?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Entirely so. The sum of \$151,578.79 was used in Montana to take care of the cricket problem. In other words, the Mormon crickets are a more serious menace to our crops in Montana than the grasshoppers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In New Mexico we have voluntary brigades. We have the National Guard, and we have hundreds of men from the W. P. A. The destruction ran into hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct. I cannot estimate the damage these pests do to us. As a matter of fact, when the crops are taken from the farmers, what happens? We have to come before this Congress and appeal to the Congress for an appropriation to keep our people from starving and freezing to death. This happens not only in Montana but all of these Northwestern States. It will only take a few dollars here to guard against this serious situation.

Last spring, as pointed out by the Bureau of Entomology, the crickets and the grasshoppers were destroyed, but later on in the season, about May, there rose into the heavens clouds of grasshoppers which came from the Dakotas into Montana and destroyed crops that were valued by the Bureau of Entomology at the sum of \$6,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to contribute something to the gentleman's statement, which is very valuable, especially to us who come from districts in which grasshoppers have done considerable damage. I have a telegram from the president of the Nebraska Crop Growers' Association who believes they should have \$6,000,000. May I ask the gentleman if he does not believe that unless the larger amount is appropriated, the one or two million dollars is practically wasted? Does not the gentleman think that the larger amount, with a real, expert program to take care of the entire insect situation, would solve the problem better than a smaller appropriation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know why they did not use the \$700,000 which they have on hand?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Apparently it came too late.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The problem, while it is your immediate problem, is a matter of concern to the whole country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right, because what concerns us in Montana concerns every State in the Union. If we lose our crops in Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, we will have to come down here to Congress and my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], than whom there is no more courteous, able, and influential Member on the floor of this House, will help us get an appropriation to feed our people. So it is your concern and it is the concern of every member of this Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I was impressed with the gentleman's statement a moment ago, as well as the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman stated he did not want to detract from the plea made by our friends from New England.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. And he further stated that this is a matter of concern to the entire country. We have only a little of this pest, thank God, in Arizona, but I understand there are 24 States of the Union bothered to some extent with this same situation. I would like to call the Committee's attention to the fact there are dynamic hazards as well as potential hazards. The fire hazard is a potential hazard. When you are dealing with insects you are dealing with a destructive force that some scientists tell us is likely to conquer the world and is worse than militarism among humans. You are dealing with a very dynamic hazard and it directly affects more than half the States of this Union.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think the gentleman has finished his discussion as to the amount necessary for the eradication of these insects. The gentleman is correct in stating this is a national problem, but I still believe if we are going to appropriate only one or two million dollars we are wasting the money unless we appropriate a sufficient amount to completely cover the situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. We should appropriate a larger amount; that will take care of the situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Committee on Appropriations may answer that by stating that when the demand arises Congress will act. You know what happens here. You know that you cannot get any bill through the House that is controversial in nature without extended debate. It takes time. Why not have some confidence in the Department that has the administration of this fund and give such an amount at this time as will enable the Department to carry on an effective campaign to destroy these pests, in case of an emergency, which are the greatest of menaces to the West. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much impressed and very much stirred by the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and also by the gentleman from Montana. I am in entire sympathy with their appeals. What they are asking, of course, is of a constructive character.

However, there are other things than grasshoppers and crickets that are hazards to the people of this country, and other things than hurricanes and fires. Sometimes, perhaps, in an unguarded moment we are responsible for certain devastating legislation that brings great injury to large numbers of persons in this country.

I recall that when the campaign was on in 1932 things became very tense, and farmers all over this country were listening to the campaign speeches made at that time because they were deeply concerned with possible legislation that might be placed on the statute books in the event of the election of one candidate or the other. At that time the farmers, and particularly the dairymen and the cattlemen, were very eager to know just what would be the fate of the tariff rates on farm products if Franklin D. Roosevelt were elected President and his party put in power. I imagine many communications were received by President Roosevelt, then Candidate Roosevelt, urging him to state his position on the question of the tariff on farm products. At any rate, on October 25, 1932, he spoke in Baltimore, and millions of men listened intently to what he had to say. At that time he made this statement:

It is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer in the United States knows it and will not be deceived.

It is quite evident from the majority Mr. Roosevelt received, especially in the farm sections, that the people relied on his assurance that the tariff duties on farm products would not be reduced. All the farmers knew was that he had made that assertion and that promise. They did not know

how easily he would break that promise, as many other promises have been broken, if trusted with power.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House, and especially those representing farm interests, to the fact that it was not long after Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States that he asked Congress to delegate certain powers to him to exercise through the Secretary of State in the handling of tariff duties. The power he requested was delegated to him. The result was a series of trade agreements with various countries. Among these trade agreements was one entered into with our neighbor to the north, Canada. Tariff duties were reduced in that agreement. He could go only as far as the statute permitted, which was a 50-percent reduction of the rates in the 1930 Tariff Act; but later, under a second agreement, he reduced the duty on cattle, dairy cows, cream, whole milk, white seed potatoes, and white potatoes the full 50 percent, just as low, in fact, as the statute permitted him to go.

My statement would not be complete unless I gave some evidence of the effect of the lowering of these duties. The fact is that imports of cattle from Canada increased 56 percent from 1935 to 1936. Then from 1936 to 1937 there was an increase of 66 percent, or an increase from 1935 to 1937 of 122 percent. These increases in imports occurred under the first trade agreement with Canada; but now a new trade agreement with Canada has been entered into which not only further reduces the rates but increases the quotas of cattle and dairy cows that may enter our market.

The American farmer faces a serious situation. When we consider that imports of cattle from Canada under the old trade agreement exceeded the quota by more than 67,000 head it is safe to assume that under the new trade agreement, with lower rates of duty and enlarged quotas, the number of imported cattle from Canada will increase to the full quota limit. I may say we are feeling the effects in our markets up in the North. Our farmers have gone into Buffalo and cooled their heels for hours while Canadian trucks were being unloaded and the Canadians were underselling them in the Buffalo market. This has been true all along the border.

I wish to discuss another item. We reduced the duty on cream.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he has had occasion to observe the conditions along the New England border?

Mr. REED of New York. I shall be pleased to answer the question.

Mr. BREWSTER. During the hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information Mr. Grady, the chairman, stated he had secured a concession from Canada by allowing potatoes from the United States to enter Canada free of duty. I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not the fact we can send potatoes to Canada free of duty is calculated to offset the devastating effect of the importation of some millions of bushels of Canadian potatoes into the American market?

Mr. REED of New York. I am very glad to reply to that question.

Occasionally for educational purposes to see what our good neighbors are doing and since I live not very far away from the Canadian line I have taken trips into various parts of Canada. Last year in the early part of September, I drove up through that great potato empire in Maine, Aroostook County, which is so ably represented by the gentleman who has just propounded the inquiry. Proceeding up through that great territory, with its wonderful storage houses, fertile fields, and its farm machinery, and where I saw more potato fields than I had supposed existed in the United States of America, I went across the Canadian border. The people on that side of the border have the same fertile land and produce the same types and grades of potatoes as are

produced in Maine. In talking with a very distinguished and well-informed man in a small city in Maine located on our northern border I made some inquiries of him with regard to conditions at that time, and as I recall it—and if I am not correct the gentleman from Maine will correct me—buyers were then offering only 35 cents a barrel for first-grade potatoes raised in Aroostook County. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. The farmers were in a desperate plight and I said to this well-informed gentleman, "Can you compete?" and he said: "No; the cost of production in Canada is so much lower; I own land on both sides of the border, the same kind of land, one just as fertile as the other and," he said, "my taxes on the land on the Maine side are \$60 a year while the same amount of land used for the same purpose on the Canadian side is taxed \$2," and he said further: "You will notice why this is true when you enter Canada."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I drove up along that border and through Canada; on the other side the roads were inferior, the schools were inferior, the pupils or parents had to furnish their own books and supplies in the schools, and in driving along the border on a Sunday for a distance of 100 miles, we counted the number of horses and buggies which we met and counted over 500 horses and buggies and noted that the churchyards were filled with horses and buggies, and we met only 25 automobiles.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then the gentleman would think that this reciprocal trade policy is nicely calculated to send us back to the "horse and buggy" age?

Mr. REED of New York. It is inevitable that if we raise our cost of production here to a point beyond the cost of production abroad, they are going to take our markets, and if they take our markets we face the proposition that we must accept a lower standard of living unless we are prepared to protect our own market. Have I answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I am very much indebted to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Let me go a little bit further. We have gradually reduced the tariff on cream, and in driving through there I saw the preparations being made to take advantage of these lower tariff rates, and to show you how unfair they have been in these trade agreements, which have lowered the tariff on cream from 56 and a fraction cents a gallon to 28¾ cents, in driving through one of the dairy sections of Canada along toward evening at milking time there was a downpour of rain. The milk cans were standing out in the open field and 25 or 30 men would be milking at one time out in the rain with the rain pouring down over the backs of the cows and running into the pails or soaking through the felt hats and sweaters of these men and then running into the milk pails. There are no sanitary restrictions in these trade agreements. You can go up into New York State or along the border in Wisconsin and see the sanitary requirements adding to the cost of production of our farmers, and yet this milk or cream comes in from Canada under the conditions I have mentioned with all this filth and disease germs to be sold in our markets.

It is not difficult to predict the effect which the lowering of the duty on cream will have on the volume imported. I need mention only what occurred when the duty on cream during the first half of 1929 was 20 cents a gallon. Under that law duty imports of cream in the first half of 1929 were 2,964,189 gallons. When the duty was raised by Presidential proclamation, effective June 13, 1929, Canada exported to the United States during the next 6 months only 1,942,704 gallons of cream. The Tariff Act of 1930 increased the duty on cream

to 56½ cents a gallon; the imports of cream from Canada dropped to 117,168 gallons.

Where is this going to end? Must we pauperize our farmers by whittling away our protection through these trade agreements? There is not a man on the floor of this House, not one, who would have dared vote for a bill brought into this House seeking to lower these duties as they have been lowered by these trade agreements, and yet we have given away the rights of a sovereign people and placed them in the hands of bureaucrats under a Department of this Government that would not dare go to the people and ask for their suffrage upon their record made by these trade agreements. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will tell me whether or not he is in favor of this bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of this bill. There is an item in there which should not be there, and when you spend three and a half million dollars on a deficiency appropriation bill to construct a new building, that is contrary to sound legislation and I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about the \$3,000,000 for the New England States?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman asked me if I was in favor of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about that item? The three million for New England.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman gets down to specific items I will answer in respect to specific items. There are some things that we are in favor of and some things that we are opposed to, and the gentleman from Missouri knows very well that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was never found wanting in expressing his opinion one way or the other, yes or no.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman seems to be found wanting now, and if he is in favor of that item, then I want to ask him where are we going to get the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Let me tell him where we will get the money.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield. In reference to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] concerning the three and a half million dollars for the Census Bureau, I have been trying for many years to get this Congress to authorize an appropriation to construct a concrete building, not any marble structure, nor one out of Indiana limestone, somewhere in the southwest section where we can store all of what might be called the inactive files of this Government.

Mr. RICH. I say to the gentleman that that is a mighty sensible thing to recommend, and I hope that sometime it will be constructed.

Mr. COCHRAN. If that kind of a building is constructed, I predict that 40 percent of the space now occupied by Government agencies in the city of Washington will be released for desks. Old files only used occasionally should be removed from the beautiful buildings and placed in what I would call a warehouse—stored where the file clerks can get their hands on them quickly and send them up to the department whenever it is necessary. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced that bill again this year, and I have taken the floor to again call attention to it. I shall ask the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to give me a hearing. I have already had one hearing. There was a conference where the committee was appointed to decide as to whether or not it was desirable to construct that building.

A majority of those on this committee were in favor of the warehouse, but it finally ended up in putting three and a half million dollars more in The Archives Building, constructing

stacks in the center of that building. That three and a half million dollars would have constructed the type of building that I have referred to—space to be set aside for every department and independent establishment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is an absolute necessity, as the gentleman should know, to have a place for the Census Bureau to work. The Constitution says we must take the census every 10 years. Now, I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I say—and I have said on the floor time and time again—that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] knows how to save money for the Government, if he will only do it, and being a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments it ought to be his duty to do it, not only here but every place. His suggestion is a mighty fine one, and if Members will look at the hearings on this bill, on page 10, they will see where we are spending money for rentals at the rate of \$22,745 for 1,830 square feet of space for Government buildings, and a great part of that is being used for files. Nothing in the world would be more desirable than what the gentleman is now recommending, and he will find the gentleman from Pennsylvania supporting him and voting for a bill of that kind.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. The committee of which I am the chairman has no jurisdiction over the bill that I have introduced. If it did, I would have had it reported long ago. As I said, the Census Bureau must have a place to work. The Census Bureau files are going to be always active from now on, because they are being used every day by every State in the Union in checking up the age of applicants for old-age assistance. You cannot put those files in the Archives Bureau. You have to put them in a warehouse. Then you have the record of every man that served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since their inception. They are not in the Archives. Some of them are even stored at Governors Island, N. Y. You have historical documents from the World War that are stored at Governors Island, N. Y. You have files of this Government, valuable files, in hundreds of places. The General Accounting Office alone has 14 different places where it is now storing its documents. You cannot conceive the damage that would result if they were destroyed by fire. The necessity for this warehouse is apparent.

In conclusion, I say this. I do not know whether I am going to be able to be here tomorrow, but if I am I am not going to support this \$3,000,000 appropriation.

Those who have suffered have my sympathy. I also was in sympathy with the million W. P. A. workers who are going off the W. P. A. rolls unless the Senate restores the \$875,000,000 asked by the administration. Many who are very active in support of this item did not have the same view on the W. P. A. appropriation as I had, but voted for the reduction of \$125,000,000. That, however, has nothing to do with my opposition to this appropriation.

We have, from time to time, I know, assisted others in distress but consult the record and you will see it was loans, not grants. It is the principle I fear. Using the language of some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle when they were opposing some so-called New Deal measures, "just another experiment, I suppose." Well it is a very dangerous experiment, and one you are going to hear from at some future date.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if I am here tomorrow I am not going to support it. My reason is that I believe we are establishing a policy that will come back to plague us. Every time you have a disaster in this country, due to an act of God, you will have Members from that section of the country saying, "Well, look what you did for the New England States. Do the same for us."

I will vote for an authorization to loan the people of the New England States \$10,000,000, if necessary, but I will not vote to hand them \$3,000,000 without any strings attached to its whatsoever, other than it be matched by the States. It is simply a gift, so when you do this for the New England

States, remember you are going to do it for other parts of the country.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I notice in the papers that at the time of this disaster the W. P. A. was very active in the expenditure of funds. I wonder if the hearings disclose how much money was spent by them at that time?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is covered in the hearings, I understand.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman said it was not within the jurisdiction of the committee to prevent the expenditures to construct this building. I want the gentleman to tell the House, especially the new Members, just what the committee's jurisdiction is.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows the jurisdiction of the committee. He is the ranking member on the minority side. He knows what the jurisdiction is. But I will say among our duties is to investigate the executive branch of the Government at any time any Member of this House lays before the committee any concrete evidence of fraud or waste. I have told the gentleman on this floor time and time again that whenever he will put the evidence on the table that will warrant an investigation he can have it, but not before.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is, if we bring the skunk and lay it there you will help us smell it, but you would not try to catch the skunk. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, the gentleman brought in one skunk. He made so many speeches that finally Mr. Hopkins said to me, "COCHRAN, I am tired of you defending me on the floor of the House. I will come down." I brought him down. The gentleman from Massachusetts had his opportunity, and if ever I felt sorry for a man in my life I felt sorry for my friend from Massachusetts when Mr. Hopkins got through. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I was sorry for myself. I never was so insulted. Every Democratic member of the committee rushed to the defense of Hopkins. I was not allowed to proceed hardly at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, if you will read the hearings, nobody had a chance to say anything but the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Are the hearings in print?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly.

Mr. GIFFORD. Has the gentleman any copies left?

Mr. COCHRAN. I believe we have some. I do not know. They were so uninteresting that I do not know whether they are there or not. I will look, and if I find one I will send the gentleman a copy.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will acknowledge that is the only day, 1 day in 6 years, and no one else has been allowed to come before the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. But the gentleman has never laid the evidence on the table.

Mr. GIFFORD. I or no one else could produce evidence enough for his committee to act.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not deal in skunks. I did not investigate your administration during the last 2 years of Hoover. I was fair. I am not going to investigate my own unless facts warranting an investigation are placed before me. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help addressing myself to the remarks of the President of the United States on January 4 on the state of the Nation. He made this statement:

And we still intend to do our own thinking.
We still intend to do our own thinking.

Now the question in my mind is, does he expect the Congress to do its own thinking, or does the President, Cohen, Corcoran, and company, expect to do the thinking and send

the bills to Congress for us to rubber stamp? I can hardly think that is possible. I do not believe the Members of Congress will rubber stamp any more legislation, and I think we will see different legislation in the House during this session than we have seen before during the New Deal administration of F. D. Roosevelt.

On yesterday I asked the majority leader a question about Government finances, and the insinuation was, "Where are we going to get the money?" He did not want to reply to me, or at least he did not. I feel that today the responsibility for the operation of this Government devolves upon the membership of Congress, especially the leaders of the majority party. When I pick up the Treasury statement of January 16, and I think of the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, and the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and others, and when I think of the importance of the offices which those men hold with the majority party, I say to you as Members of Congress, it is up to the men I have just mentioned to lead the way and show the people of this country we are going to economize in our Government spending. It can easily be done—should and must.

I call your attention to the fact that the Democratic Party in its platform of 1932 said:

We will abolish useless commissions and offices, consolidate departments and bureaus, and eliminate extravagances to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of government.

I now call attention to the remarks of the President of the United States on March 10, 1933, when he addressed the Congress as follows:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy. With the utmost seriousness I pointed out to the Congress the profound effect of this upon our national economy. Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

The Hoover administration in the 3 years the President talked about went into the red \$3,500,000,000, but after 6 years of his administration he has put the country in debt \$20,000,000,000. What does Mr. Roosevelt think of his economy measures? I know what I think of them, as well as millions of other American citizens. It is a crime against our American civilization for a man in high and responsible public office to tell you he will do one thing when he gets in office and then to repudiate his word when he does get in. It is almost inconceivable that he could change so completely around. No stretch of the imagination could give a logical and businesslike reason.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the condition of the Treasury as shown by the Treasury statement of January 16, published by the Treasury Department, Mr. Morgenthau's secretary. We find that we have gold to the extent of \$14,594,000,000 belonging to the Government. Where is it stored? In a hole in the ground down in Kentucky. And they are storing the silver of this country in a hole in the ground up at West Point. This story of buried treasure reminds me of the old story that when you hide your treasures they are of no value. This is where we find ourselves today so far as our gold and silver are concerned. It is of no value. It is in the hands of the President of the United States only, and he can use it at any time he sees fit. Be careful he does not declare an emergency exists before he goes out of office and he will be the sole controller and I might say sole owner.

Looking at this Treasury statement again, I am shocked to find that the Government has a balance of \$3,000,000,000 lying in the banks of this country on which the taxpayers are paying interest. Why under the sun is it necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury to carry such a balance? It was never thought of or dreamed of by Secretaries of the Treasury before Mr. Morgenthau came into office. Why is it necessary today? There is a reason, but it is not a good one—let him answer it; I have asked the question a number of times, but no answer.

Let me call attention further to the fact that since July 1 the taxpayers of this country have paid \$3,087,000,000. Against that receipt you have expended \$4,920,000,000. This shows that we have gone in the red, since July 1 last, to the extent of \$1,833,000,000. We will be close to four billion in the red by the end of the year. Terrible, horrible, unexcusable, unbusinesslike, unheard of in peacetime. It shows to our people this administration knows nothing of running the Government.

A few years ago the President of the United States talked about a balanced Budget. He has forgotten that phrase today. He says nothing about it, and he knows nothing about it.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

If we keep traveling in the direction we are now going, it will be but a few years until our Government will experience the greatest wreck ever seen in the history of the world, and our children and children's children will suffer for the folly of this administration.

The establishment of a policy of responsibility and economy in government, Mr. Chairman, belongs to this Congress. The majority party promised economy in government. You promised to consolidate departments. You have had this opportunity for 6 years. Instead, however, of making that promise good, you did the very opposite.

In 1932, on November 4, in Brooklyn, N. Y., the President of the United States stated:

The people of America demand a reduction of Federal expenditures. It can be accomplished not only by reducing the expenditures of existing departments, but it can be done by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions; and it can be done by consolidating many activities of government.

After making that statement what did the President of the United States do? He established more bureaus than any other administration in the history of our Nation. At the time he took office we had 63 separate and distinct bureaus of government. He has established 61 additional bureaus and commissions. Is that the kind of reduction he promised? Think of it, men; it is a serious question.

We have a law on our statute books forbidding the Federal Government going into debt beyond \$45,000,000,000. We shall soon reach that limit of indebtedness. Before long you will have presented to the Committee on Ways and Means a bill asking that the permissible debt of the United States be increased to \$80,000,000,000.

I say to you Members of Congress that if you want to assume the responsibilities of government, if you want to assert your rights as American citizens and do the thing you ought to do, never let this resolution pass with Mr. Roosevelt in the White House. It is to be hoped that one of these major committees, the Speaker of the House, or the majority leader will try to and be successful in forcing economy in the affairs of Government. Such a bill should not pass. Every Member should rise on this floor and say, "Such a bill shall never pass under present conditions this Congress."

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I am much in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but I wish you would tell us his remedy. How are we going to take care of the unemployed? The gentleman stands simply for cutting down taxes and cutting down appropriations. Do not do it. Are we going to extend the wage and hour legislation, or what are we going to do to take care of men that have not got jobs?

Mr. RICH. Let me give the gentleman the answer. The gentleman has asked an appropriate question and I can tell him the answer. The first thing necessary to be done is to restore confidence amongst the businessmen of this country.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. That does not put food into hungry stomachs.

[Here the gavel fell].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Restore confidence amongst the businessmen of the country, so that private capital will not be afraid to venture into business. If you do this, you will be doing something that will put 300 men to work where you now put 1 man to work on the Government pay roll. We will put food in their stomachs and sunshine in their hearts, clothes on their backs, and happiness in the home.

Another thing to do is to get people off the Government pay roll at \$50 a month and get them back into industry, where they can make \$100 a month. The good, sound men of this country want jobs, not dole. The American with red blood in his veins says, "Give me a job, and I will go to work." This administration, however, tries to prohibit their working by ill-conceived laws.

Another thing you can do is to change the N. L. R. B. Act and the Wagner Act so that the businessmen and industrial men of this Nation can feel they have some rights in their own plants and that there is some opportunity ahead. It requires a business executive to run a business, and not a rabble rouser. They only breed discontent and destroy. If the businessman makes too much money, we can hold him down by the income tax, and we can by law regulate his earnings, but when we kill opportunity, we destroy all. We kill business; we destroy jobs. Confidence is lost. Government of the people and by the people is destroyed.

Let us stop these reciprocal-trade agreements. Let us keep the agricultural industry of this country for our own farmers and our own laborers instead of permitting foreign goods to come in here to usurp all of our markets—the best in the world. If we will do that, I will say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], we will put these men back to work and we will have a satisfied, happy, contented people in this country. I hope the Members of Congress will use their own minds instead of expecting the President of the United States to do everything for them. If we follow this policy we will go places, we will make this country a happy, contented country, and we will be doing that which is for the best interests of all the American people.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. That is no answer to the problem. The machines are busy. These men are out of work and they can never go back to work. The gentleman cannot find work for them.

Mr. RICH. Let us regulate mass production then so we can give them jobs and not permit machinery to do everything. Men need jobs in order to do something. Idleness breeds discontent. Idleness makes men shiftless and lazy. If the gentleman wants to regulate mass production, let him offer a bill.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. The gentleman does not point the way.

Mr. RICH. None is so blind as he who will not see.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is an item in the pending bill for the construction of another Federal building and, while it is necessary in the scheme of things, yet I suppose this would be a most appropriate time to call the attention of the members of this Committee and the Members of the House to the tremendous program of Federal construction that has been carried on since 1933.

A botanist measures the age of a tree by the number of rings. I suppose the size of the Government and its present status, so far as functions are concerned, can be measured by the amount of new construction that has taken place since 1933. Some of the figures you will find in the hearings which accompany this bill, but all of the important information is not contained therein, particularly that which relates to construction and rentals outside the District of Columbia.

There is a statement in the hearings to the effect we are renting within the confines of the District of Columbia today 120 buildings or portions thereof, with a total available space

of approximately three and one-half million square feet. I put it in that fashion because it will be easy to compare, and I think the figures bear emphasis. There are 120 leased buildings, containing three and two-thirds or three and one-half million square feet for which we pay an annual rental in the Nation's Capital of about three and one-half million dollars. Of course, that is not the whole story as we consider the proposal to appropriate in excess of \$3,000,000 for the building of a new building to be occupied by the Bureau of the Census in anticipation of the taking of the next census. It is rather interesting to see how buildings have accumulated over a period of time and to note that in and of themselves they have been insufficient to house the various governmental activities.

I received some figures from the Procurement Division this morning which I think will be interesting. I suppose some of the Members of the House do not know that in addition to the three and one-half-million-odd square feet that we rent in the Nation's Capital, we also lease almost 26,000,000 square feet outside of the District of Columbia. The total annual lease cost outside the District of Columbia is eighteen and three-fourths million dollars. But what intrigues me is the number of buildings we have built and still we are unable to catch up with the governmental functions.

Some time when you get down on Fourteenth Street, going in the direction of the bridge across the Potomac, you will find completed there very recently an annex to the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, in which building they print nice, new, green money and beautifully colored postage stamps. That building, completed recently, provides 244,292 square feet of space.

When you have occasion to call on the Secretary of Agriculture or one of the department heads in the Department of Agriculture, and you get lost running around 22 acres of stone and masonry, take particular notice of the South Building, which was completed not so long ago, containing 1,054,724 square feet of space. Also observe the Department of Agriculture's Economics Building, built since 1933, embracing over 26,000 square feet.

When you wander down Constitution Avenue you will find the place where the Attorney General has his office, together with all the divisions in that Cabinet Department. Take particular note of that swanky building that has 477,000 square feet of space. Then the very genial lady, who has been the object of some criticism here and elsewhere lately and who presides over the destinies of the Labor Department, is installed in a very beautiful structure there which contains 229,000 square feet of space.

Not so long ago they had the dedication of the Apex Building, occupied by the Federal Trade Commission. I admit they were in dismal quarters formerly, wholly unsuited to the needs of the Commission, but it is simply another accretion to the Government's building program. When that building was completed it made available 131,000 square feet of space.

Then there is the Government Printing Office warehouse, with 160,000 square feet; the new Interior Building, a tremendous monument of stone, steel, and masonry, with 541,000 square feet of space, finished last year. Then there is the Internal Revenue Building, on Constitution Avenue, with 112,000 square feet; the Interstate Commerce and the Labor connecting wing, with its auditorium, cafe, and hearing rooms, embracing 81,000 square feet; the Interstate Commerce Building proper, containing 228,000 square feet; the new Post Office Building, with 418,000 square feet; and the new Procurement Building, with 141,000 square feet.

The total area we have added through Government construction in the Nation's Capital is 4,148,000 square feet. Add to that three and one-half million square feet of rented space and add further almost 26,000,000 square feet of rented space outside the District of Columbia and you will get a pretty fair idea how this Government has grown in its activities and functions since 1933.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman let me make one more observation? Then I shall yield with the utmost grace to my good friend.

Consider all this rented space in Washington, D. C. A rough calculation indicates that if it were all rolled into one it might be a single-story building 6,000 feet long and 600 feet wide. Such a building would extend from the Union Station to the Willard Hotel and probably be four times as wide as the over-all width of Constitution Avenue.

It seems to me that here, then, is a focal point at which we can begin some reflections on the expansion of governmental functions. If we continue to expand in the same degree in the next 6 or 7 years, obviously we will have to carry on a more adequate building program and lease other space everywhere in the country. I do not know when and where we shall reach the end. I do want to make one observation, however, and I believe my good friend the gentleman from Colorado will bear me out in this, that we are centralizing and centralizing and centralizing in the Nation's Capital to the point where the Government workers must go to work in three shifts in the morning and go back home in three shifts at night in order to avoid and avert constant traffic congestion. I know of no particular reason why we have to be always concentrating these functions in the Nation's Capital.

The census is an activity of government that requires no particular identity with other establishments in Washington. They are going to gather up their own data. They are going to calculate it on machines, some of which have been devised by persons in their own Department and others of which must be rented. Is there any reason you can think of why a building for that Bureau must be placed in Washington and another 7,500 people ultimately at peak operations of the Census Bureau be added to the congestion that has obtained here all these years? Why can it not be located in Chicago? Why can it not be located in Detroit? Why can it not be located in St. Louis? I see no reason in particular why it must be placed here. So it occurs to me that the members of the Committee might well consider this whole scheme of decentralization, which, in my judgment, would be very happy for the Nation's Capital and would render equity and justice to the rest of the taxpayers of the Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Soon we shall hear a voluminous discussion of the national-defense program and the need for providing protection to certain parts of the country that are considered vulnerable especially in time of war. I wonder whether we are not year after year making the Nation's Capital more and more vulnerable by concentrating virtually every activity of government here. If there is anything to the representations and protestations that somebody might send an airplane carrier within 500 miles of our shores and then send bombing planes on, why, the first place to which any military tactician would direct his efforts would be the Nation's Capital. With every activity of the Government concentrated here, such an attack would in great measure destroy the coordinated functions of government in a very little while. Unless it can be demonstrated that the Census Bureau is so dependent on other agencies for information and service as to cripple its functions by removal to another site, there is much to be said in favor of taking these functions elsewhere.

I speak also for the taxpayers of the country. In the case of this building for the Census Bureau, whatever information they need from other governmental departments can be obtained by telephone or by telegraph, or by air mail or some other means of communication. I am wondering whether it is going to be the policy and the best possible program to add another huge building to the collection of masonry that already exists in Washington, D. C.

Now I yield to my very charming and gracious friend from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have listened very attentively to the enumeration of the large buildings which have recently

been erected in Washington by the Government. I notice the gentleman took particular pains to state these buildings had been constructed since 1933.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman I was just expressing a fact without emphasis.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I recognized only one building in the list, and that was the new Interior Department Building, which actually originated under this administration. The gentleman might have mentioned the \$15,000,000 Babylonian palace over here across the park housing the Supreme Court, and he might have mentioned the great building recently constructed as an annex to the Library of Congress. All of these buildings were authorized under previous Republican administrations, and the program started then.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My able friend, the gentleman from Colorado, can always pick out the weakness in an argument. However, I wish to say to the gentleman, who, along with so many others some years ago when I first came here, was inveighing against this great monument they referred to as Hoover's folly, now known as the Commerce Building, that we had only a handful of people in that building when it was completed, but you came along just in time to occupy it from cellar to garret and had to build extra walls and partitions in the building until the total number of people working there in one building finally reached 12,000, under the able leadership of General Johnson and his N. R. A. While the building was there and was occupied by us we did not pile up all the activities on the program and force thousands of people upon the Federal pay roll.

There were only some 40,000 or 50,000 people working in Washington then. Look at the Civil Service Commission list today. There are nearly 120,000 on Uncle Sam's pay roll in the District of Columbia. So, while we authorized it, and for a very good purpose, we did not make it a beehive of industry that was one day going to fall upon the shoulders of the taxpayers as a great, onerous burden.

That, I think, is a suitable and sufficient answer to my friend the gentleman from Colorado.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, it does occur to me that we are going on with a program of centralization that is not good for this city, and one that is not fair or equitable to the rest of the taxpayers of the country, and I see no good reason why the rest of the country should not have the benefit of some of the jobs that are always concentrated around the construction of a building and why the masons and the architects and the skilled workers and others in other portions of the country should not share in the beneficences of the Federal Treasury and of the present administration. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has set a reasonably good example in making a 26-percent cut on this bill. The only trouble is it did not cut deep enough.

There was such a nice opportunity to wipe off another three and a half million dollars which the committee did not embrace. This bill carries \$3,500,000 to put up a building for the Bureau of the Census, and let me say to you that that building would only be required for about 1 year and 3 months, for then the work would have evaporated and there would be nothing with which to fill up the building. It is absolutely unnecessary that we do this.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] pointed out earlier today, the thing we need to do is to get rid of some of those highfalutin, worthless agencies that are occupying rented space. We might better pay rent for 15 months than to spend three and a half million dollars for a building that is only necessary for 15 months.

Now what are some of these agencies that we could just as well evaporate or just as well get rid of and save a few dollars for the taxpayers as we go along; some of these agencies that are feeding off of the vitals of the Republic

and sapping the strength of our taxpayers and destroying their independence?

Let me say to you that the average rental that is paid is 95 cents a square foot, but let me read to you some of these highfalutin agencies and the amount they pay for their space:

National Defense Power Committee, 7,990 square feet, \$19,974.96, or \$2.50 a square foot.

Central Statistical Board, 6,700 square feet, \$10,084.44 or \$1.50 per square foot.

Federal Housing Administration, 18,000 square feet at \$17,000, and 100,000 square feet at \$155,000, and 48,000 square feet at \$74,000.

National Emergency Council, that council that came in here a year ago with a statement to the public that they had to have more money in an election year, 16,500 square feet at \$28,800, or \$1.70 a square foot.

National Labor Relations Board, 29,790 square feet at \$74,475, or \$2.50 a square foot.

T. V. A., 2,800 square feet at \$6,300, or upward of \$2 a square foot.

About three-fourths of these institutions which I have read and referred to and which actually pay the bulk of the high-priced rent that is paid by this Government out of the 3,600,000 square feet of rented space, should be abolished immediately and we should get rid of that cancer on the Government of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Unfortunately, that happy situation cannot be brought about until 1941, I may say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Well, that may be; but I have been hopeful that this Congress would have common sense enough to abolish a number of these worthless and useless agencies and get rid of some of this cancer that is sapping the vitals of America.

On top of this, even according to the program of the administration, there is a curtailment proposed in the W. P. A. proposition which should release space sufficient to take care of 2,500 of the employees of the Census Bureau that will need to be housed long before the requirement for the space can be met.

It seems to me that it is the height of folly to construct more buildings at this time to satisfy the greed of the bureaucrats to fill that space. I do not believe that the situation in Washington at this time justifies such a thing as going ahead with a building of that character. If you will look over the hearings from pages 8 to 14, inclusive, you will find almost invariably that those institutions that are carrying the high rental charge are the ones that could be gotten rid of, that there would be plenty of space available out of that occupied by the 22,000 who are in rented space here in the District of Columbia. There is plenty of opportunity to get rid of 4,500 and make room for all we need in the Census Bureau. For that reason, when this item in the bill is reached, when we read the bill under the 5-minute rules, I propose that we shall have an opportunity to vote on whether we want to saddle the taxpayers with more buildings.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is speaking of square footage. Has this been broken down at any time so as to give us an idea of what it cost per employee for rent? In other words, does it run as high as \$600 per annum per employee in some cases?

Mr. TABER. The T. V. A. runs \$300. The National Emergency Council runs \$250. The National Labor Relations Board runs \$250.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What about the P. W. A., to be found on page 12? Does not that run about \$600 per clerk per annum for rental space?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, as high as \$600 per capita.

Mr. TABER. Six hundred dollars per employee, but, of course, that is a highfalutin organization. I did not happen to see that. They are not like ordinary Government clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask again with reference to one of the new bureaus covered in the hearings? I have just briefly glanced at it. It is the Wage and Hour Division. I understand that Department is just getting into form and digging its channel, so to speak. It is looking forward to having a minimum of 1,500 employees.

Mr. TABER. It is looking forward to a disbursement of better than \$3,000,000 a year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For clerical staff?

Mr. TABER. Yes; for clerical and administrative staff. Some of them do not even do clerical work—some of these professors and economists and that sort of thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do we understand that these 1,500 listed are not the maximum that they expect to have when they get into full bloom?

Mr. TABER. All I know is that the Budget estimate calls for better than \$3,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where will that Bureau be housed?

Mr. TABER. A part of it will be in the Labor Department Building, and a part of it spread around. I understand there is only one item of rental here for it. There is 729 Fifteenth Street, 2,700 square feet, but only 35 employees. Of course, they are going to have before the 1st of July 400 employed in the field as snoopers and inspectors, try to annoy these fellows who have only two or three employees who do not come under the act that the Wage and Hour Commissioner has in my opinion illegally ruled should be brought under it, and they are going to annoy those businessmen who have two or three employees and have not any business being brought in under the act by following them up. The big fellows are a minor problem.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand that Administrator Andrews can make a ruling which has the effect of law that such employees are within the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TABER. He cannot, but he thinks he can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the industrial operator in the field goes along then under the assumption that he is covered by the bill after this ruling is made.

Mr. TABER. That is it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But it does not have the effect of law?

Mr. TABER. It does not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the gentleman anything in the hearings about complaints against Administrator Andrews and Mr. Magruder along the lines of those which have been filed against the National Labor Relations Board insofar as the administration of the Wage and Hour Act is concerned?

Mr. TABER. No; I have not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has not heard of any reports like that?

Mr. TABER. Nothing of that kind. I do not think from anything that I have heard that he has overreached himself in that fashion at all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself another 5 minutes to say a word or two about the rest of the bill. With reference to this item for grasshoppers, I thought that we were pretty fairly liberal. There is \$2,000,000 appropriated and there is \$700,000 left over and that should fairly meet the situation. It is \$700,000 more than what was spent last year and with no reason to believe that there would be a situation that they would be facing that would be worse.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a very high regard, I may say, for the gentleman's economic views and his purpose in trying to economize as much as possible, but I find in these hearings where Dr. Strong testified that for every dollar

expended last year on grasshopper control alone, \$79 was saved. Now, does not the gentleman think if we have an infestation of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets as we did last year, the sum ought to be sufficient to deal with the subject now instead of having to come back to Congress later on to deal with the menace?

Mr. TABER. The money will be available now. This bill, in my opinion, will be passed and become a law within 2 weeks. The money will be available when it can be used most efficiently. From everything I could get from the entire set-up, including the fact that they failed to use \$700,000 of the money that was available last year, this will be sufficient. They said they did not get the money until too late to use it. On the other hand, they told us that they did not come too late when we were appropriating the money, so we have to bear that in mind when we consider that question. We are giving them \$700,000 more than they had last year. That will enable them to go out on some of this land that is not cultivated, and for which the farmer receives certain benefits and emoluments for keeping it out of cultivation, and correct the situation to a certain extent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The very fact that this Department did not expend this \$700,000 shows that they can be entrusted with the money. Is it not advisable to give them a sufficient amount of money to deal with the usual infestation of grasshoppers and crickets to the end that they will have it if they need it, and the fact that they did not spend it before shows that they will not expend it unless it is necessary?

Mr. TABER. You know they have been coming here with a build-up on that situation for a great many years getting increased appropriations. There is not any evidence that they have it in hand any better today than when they first started. I think we ought not to give them more money than it is manifest they could use intelligently. I think we have given them enough.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not understand what the gentleman from Montana said, but is this grasshopper money spent for the purpose of exterminating pests after they appear or is it spent for the prevention of the appearance? I think it makes a great deal of difference whether we appropriate the money for one purpose or the other.

Mr. TABER. I think it is entirely spent for poison that kills the grasshoppers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And also the eggs.

Mr. TABER. But I do not think it does go into the question of getting rid of the eggs.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the money is available and will only be expended if the crickets or grasshoppers appear?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about the crickets. I cannot tell you about that.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, the gentleman referred to crickets.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Montana did, but I cannot answer that question. I do not know whether their method of killing the crickets gets rid of the eggs or not, but the grasshoppers are only killed with this poison bait that they have after they come to life.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. Is it not a fact that the extermination is a matter dependent almost entirely on the weather? That is, these things develop very rapidly.

Mr. TABER. Cold, damp weather tends to kill them off.

Mr. HAWKS. And they develop very rapidly under certain conditions?

Mr. TABER. Yes, that is true; in warm, dry weather.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have seen that territory and I have seen the damage they can do. I am very much in favor of the appropriation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is the gentleman in favor of increasing it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman mean to increase the New England item or the grasshopper item?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Both.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is a good watchdog of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand from the report, on page 2, which gives a summary of the items in the bill, it mentions the Budget estimate of \$3,300,000 for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine: Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, 1939, \$3,300,000, but the bill, as I understand, only contains \$2,000,000, which is a decrease of \$1,300,000 under the Budget recommendation.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

That is true. At the same time, there are \$700,000 more available to them than they spent last year. The committee felt, after considering the thing very carefully, that that, with \$2,000,000 more, was sufficient for them to do everything they could do intelligently.

Now, I want to take a minute or two about the New England situation. The committee has brought in \$3,000,000 to help with the fire-hazard situation resulting from the hurricane.

There it is proposed to use this money with an equal amount to be matched by the States to get rid of the brush, clean up the roads and trails through the forests, and back a ways from the roads and the trails so that the fire hazard will not be so great. It is also intended to make breaks through the forest 200 or 300 feet wide so that if a fire should start it could not spread all over. With the situation that was presented to us and the evidence that we had available, I think this is about as far as the committee could be asked to recommend. We have not yet had evidence of what the local communities and States are going to do. Massachusetts itself has appropriated \$19,000,000. I understand that \$1,000,000 of that is to be used for this particular purpose. In Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire, all of which are affected by this situation quite extensively, their legislatures have just met and are considering the proposition. I have no doubt but what they will provide funds to do something that may help the situation in their States and meet their share of any obligation that should be met.

I hope that the Committee can go along and carry this item.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, to descend from discussing the marble and granite fortresses here in the city of Washington to discussing grasshoppers is quite a tumble from the sublime to the ridiculous. It is rather funny and mirthful as a subject of debate here, but to those who have witnessed this phenomenon there is absolutely nothing funny or laughable about these insect infestations. When you consider the vast areas over which they occur, when you consider that these insects can travel from 500 to 700 miles per day with a favorable wind, when you consider that they actually eat the heavy-corded canvas coverings off of gas-tank hose, eat the carpets off of the floor, eat fence posts, eat all the foliage on the trees until they kill the trees, and when you

consider that they move in solid waves over great areas and destroy everything in their path, even a flood does not compare in crop damage with a grasshopper invasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. My time is too limited to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wanted to make an appropriate observation at that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Very well; make the observation, but do not ask a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was it in the gentleman's country that the grasshoppers ate the feathers off of the turkeys? [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. They not only ate the feathers off the turkeys, they ate the turkeys. [Laughter.] I just cannot fancy a hungry grasshopper contenting itself with feathers when there is a turkey under the feathers. [Laughter.]

Seriously, I remember reading some years ago a prediction that eventually insect life would destroy and exterminate every other form of life on the globe; and it really makes a fellow think of that when he sees one of these infestations. I have seen such things as this, that when the eggs hatched and the insects got so they could just crawl, because they had developed sufficiently to fly, looking over that vast area of moving insects it looked like the surface of water rippled by the wind. If you do not think that will make the flesh crawl on your back and make you want to vote for big grasshopper control appropriations, I am here to tell you.

But this is really what I got up to say: My experience in 1937 caused me to have very great confidence in the Bureau of Entomology, in its knowledge of this situation, and in the reliability of its prognostications. It is true it transpired that last year they were not able to use all the money appropriated. I think there was a balance of \$700,000 that may be available in 1939. That was due, however, to a very great change in weather that occurred out in that country at the critical hatching period in the spring. We had a great deal more snow and cold rain over that area along in March and April than we had had in a good many years, and this arrested the development of the insects.

In 1937 the Budget asked \$2,000,000 for insect control. This recommendation came up here in the latter part of January or early in February. The committee cut it to \$1,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget stated that the Bureau of Entomology had predicted an infestation in 24 States. The infestation developed in 24 States, and just about the time the \$1,000,000 was gone the grasshoppers, the crickets, and so forth were just getting good and beginning to spread. It developed that more money was needed, and an additional \$1,000,000 was appropriated, but it was appropriated too late.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that every resource of those States was thrown into action to save the situation. Why, in Colorado they called out the National Guard, they requisitioned all the trucks of the National Park Service, of the highway department, of the National Guard, and the C. C. C. camps. They threw the C. C. C. boys into action. That was the only order of business throughout that whole area for several weeks—simply fighting grasshoppers.

I am not going to mention any names, but something happened at that time which shows that it is an ill wind that blows no man good. When I saw that the \$1,000,000 was not going to go far enough I went down to every agency of the Government that could deal with the matter. I found they had scraped the barrel clean. I put in the resolution to appropriate the other \$1,000,000 which was recommended in the Budget. I was informed, however, by a very influential member of the committee that it was too late to get action on a resolution of that sort and to make any appropriation; that all I could do was to make my showing and lay the ground work for the next year.

One morning I got a call from his office. He said, "MARTIN, can you run over to my office? Come on over. I want to show you something." I went over there. He had a daily paper from his own district. He lived in another

State that was supposed to be entirely beyond the danger of invasion. Across the top of the front page of the daily paper was the statement that his State was threatened with the greatest grasshopper invasion in its history.

He said, "How long do you think it will take you to get your grasshopper people before the committee? Can you do it before 10 o'clock?" I said, "You bet I can." By 10 o'clock I had the best bunch of grasshopper storytellers you ever saw before that committee. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], where they really grow grasshoppers, came on last and stole the show so far as telling grasshopper stories is concerned. At 3 o'clock the resolution passed the House by unanimous consent.

We got action on that million dollars, but if it had not been for the invasion by grasshoppers of one congressional district we would not have gotten the money.

We have a lot of confidence in the knowledge of the Bureau of Entomology. The Bureau of Entomology is a scientific organization that knows its business. It does its job and it generally does it accurately. Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine their asking for \$6,000,000 to take care of a situation wherein \$2,000,000 would be sufficient. I do not honestly believe that Bureau would do that. So far as I know, the Bureau of Entomology has never come up here before and asked for any such sum as that. I believe when they do ask for it they have the information on which to base a campaign calling for the expenditure of that amount of money or else they would not ask for such an appropriation. If more is provided for them than they need, they will do what they did last year. They will not expend it and it will be a carry-over to future years.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman says and I know for a fact, being a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations, that the Bureau of Plant Quarantine and Entomology is one of the very fine agencies of the Government. My district is not seriously affected by this matter, but the gentleman's district is and many others are. I wish the gentleman would state to the House what the accomplishments were as a result of the money spent last year in connection with the protection of the farmers' crops in those regions where the work was carried on.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I can only say it was very effective, but would have been more so had the \$2,000,000 been appropriated in the first place.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield? I think I can answer that question, as shown by the hearings, copy of which I hold in my hand. Dr. Strong testified, and it is undisputed in the record, that of every dollar expended by the Federal Government \$79 were saved. If that is not a good investment, I do not know what would be.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his figures. Mr. Chairman, when you have an infestation in 24 States, and, as stated in this report, they anticipate a grasshopper infestation in 22 States and an infestation of Mormon crickets in 11 States, that means half of the area of the United States, and when you consider it is in the western country, it is more than half the area of the United States. In an extraordinary year it would be very easy to infest the other half. It was an astonishing piece of information to me that these insects could move as far as 700 miles in 24 hours. They could rise from the district of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and could be parked in Illinois next morning.

I hope we will at least be given the \$3,300,000 recommended by the Budget, which, with the unexpended balance of \$700,000, will give us \$4,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether everyone here is familiar with what a grasshopper infestation means.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Go ahead and tell them.

Mr. BURDICK. I happen to come from the headquarters of the grasshopper damage. There are a lot of you who do not know the difference between a grasshopper and a Mormon cricket. The only difference I can see is that the horns of the Mormon cricket are a little bit larger than those of the grasshopper. I would characterize a Mormon cricket as an overgrown grasshopper. The only difference is in laying their eggs the Mormon cricket lays them wherever they stop, while the grasshoppers lay them in swarms. It is much easier to eradicate grasshoppers than it is Mormon crickets.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks here the areas in the United States which will be affected during the year 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Government has asked for something like \$6,000,000 to do this job. From that sum they have deducted \$700,000, that was not expended last year.

I want to call your attention to the fact there are about 51,000,000 acres in the United States that will be infested with grasshoppers this year. Of this 51,000,000 acres about 17,000,000 acres are raw land, unoccupied land, that is really the breeding bed for the entire grasshopper infestation. There are about two and one-half million acres of land that has been used but taken out of cultivation through foreclosure and the farm program.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Does the gentleman mean this year?

Mr. BURDICK. This year there will be 2,500,000 acres of that kind of land. That is where they breed the worst—where fields have been and have gone back. Last year they made no concerted effort to stop these grasshoppers in any section of the area except on the farms where there were crops.

The purpose this year is to do the job and do it right, and with nothing short of the \$6,000,000, with the \$700,000 deducted, can we hope to do the job. If you do not want to go the full way in making this appropriation as the Department has recommended it, I would say to you, do not appropriate any money at all, because it is useless. Let me give you an example of what occurred right in my own part of the country.

This year, in July, we had the largest crop standing we have had in the last 30 years. It would probably go from 25 to 40 bushels per acre of wheat. We had poisoned all the grasshoppers in that section of North Dakota, which is called the Missouri Slope section, the hardest part of the State to handle in respect to grasshoppers. However, we had poisoned and poisoned, and followed the directions of the Department until we had the grasshoppers cleaned out. Then, within a period of 24 hours, thousands and thousands of acres of that wheat were totally destroyed. The farmers never put a binder on a large part of it. The hoppers came in from the southwest, from the direction of Wyoming, in swarms that swarmed in the air to a height of a thousand feet. They came in with the wind. In 24 hours, as I say, millions of acres of wheat in North Dakota were destroyed.

If you do not want to go the whole way and do this job right and stop the grasshoppers in their breeding grounds, which are located by sending out an army of men to find these fields—and it is proposed to spread the poison by airplane after these areas across the country are flagged and the beds located—there is not very much use of doing anything. My experience has been that we can poison grasshoppers, but if we do not go on the vacant land, on the land that has been taken by foreclosure, which no one occupies, we might just as well let the whole thing go, because a farmer cannot lose any more than 100 percent of his crop in any event.

The Congress has never appropriated the amount of money the Department of Agriculture has recommended. It is claimed that we have \$700,000 left from the appropriation of last year, and that this shows we had too much

money then. That is not the case at all. No effort was made to poison the grasshoppers on these two types of land, vacant, unoccupied land, and the abandoned fields, which is where the grasshoppers came from this year. If we are to do the job anywhere near as it should be done I am prepared to say from practical experience that the estimates made by the Department of Agriculture are true and correct. If you propose now to spend another \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 on this job and let the grasshoppers increase in other sections of the country, my advice to the country is not to spend anything, just leave it the way it is. However, if you really intend to help us, there is something that can be done.

Let me say that the loss to the farmers of the United States from grasshoppers last year was between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000. While in some sections the expenditure of the money appropriated by Congress did help and did save some grain, and there was some general benefit, yet no attempt was made, and there never has been an attempt made in this country to stamp out this infestation absolutely, or bring the infestation under control. However, if you will appropriate what the Department has asked, some \$5,000,000, we will then be in position to control this infestation, which takes from the farmers of America an average loss of \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 every year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that when the grasshoppers got through eating you up in North Dakota they swept over into Montana and destroyed in three or four counties there wheat valued in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000?

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is correct. The loss in eastern Montana, the section adjacent to my area of North Dakota, was slightly over \$6,000,000 in one crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With regard to the fields where the "hoppers" destroyed the grain and no crop was harvested did the farmers operating those farms receive any benefits at all under the Soil Conservation Act?

Mr. BURDICK. Not any more than they had arranged for in the first place under the agricultural program. They had cut down their acreage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I mean is, did they receive any benefits due to the fact the crop was not harvested?

Mr. BURDICK. No. No insurance was in operation at that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the method used in destroying the eggs in the uncultivated fields in advance of the hatching?

Mr. BURDICK. There is no method or no program for digging down in the ground and destroying the eggs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is done? Do you poison the land?

Mr. BURDICK. We poison the "hoppers" when they are hatched, when they come out. You can destroy a lot of them by plowing, of course.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Answering the question more fully, nothing is being done except by the farmer himself who volunteers to go and get the material the Government is going to furnish him. We do not go on the field as long as someone is there.

I may say, however, the whole theory of exterminating the grasshoppers is out of the question. The only thing that will exterminate the grasshoppers is climatic conditions.

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. So no effort is being made to exterminate the grasshoppers, but only to get to the farmers the food that will poison the hoppers and get them to use it;

yet the gentleman is intimating in his remarks that we ought to aim at extermination.

Mr. BURDICK. No; I said control the damage done by the grasshoppers. There will always be grasshoppers. It would be a fool proposition for this Congress to try to exterminate the grasshoppers, because they always have been and always will be. We can control the damage they do, however.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it at the time the hatching takes place and the grasshoppers begin to appear that you apply this poison through the use of airplanes?

Mr. BURDICK. For the first 6 weeks after they are hatched. If you wait until after that time you might as well feed the poison to the wind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the wheat crop insurance provision cover the loss incurred by reason of the destruction by grasshoppers?

Mr. BURDICK. It will in 1939 and 1940, but the premium is very high and it would take about all a man has to pay for such insurance. It is all right in the eastern sections of the country where the hazard is not so great, where drought is not prevalent and where there is no hail and very few grasshoppers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that point, what did the farmers in your State who actually placed wheat on the market and sold it and collected for it last summer get per bushel for their wheat?

Mr. BURDICK. About 58 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Fifty-eight cents per bushel?

Mr. BURDICK. Fifty-eight cents for number 1 wheat, but we did not have very much of that and most of our wheat brought about 41 cents.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted me, I insert the following from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations:

Allotments for control of emergency and incipient outbreaks of insect pests

Project	Public resolutions—			Second Deficiency Act (June 25, 1938)	Total
	No. 26 (1937-38)	No. 55 (1938)	No. 81 (1938-39)		
Grasshopper control.....	\$1,000,000	\$615,000	\$1,495,000	\$500,000	\$3,610,000
Mormon-cricket control.....		169,500	314,100		483,600
White-fringed-beetle control.....		215,440	154,946		370,386
Army-worm control.....	(1)		(2)		
Unallotted.....			35,954	200,000	235,954
Total.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	700,000	4,700,000

¹ Not to exceed \$100,000 was made available for this purpose from the allotment for grasshopper control; approximately \$4,400 expended.
² Not to exceed \$50,000 is available for this purpose from the allotment for grasshopper control; approximately \$11,100 expended.

The obligations by crop years are shown in this table:

Control of emergency and incipient outbreaks of insect pests—obligations by crop seasons

	1937	1938	Total
Grasshopper control.....	\$1,103,542	\$2,120,645	\$3,224,187
Mormon-cricket control.....	6,571	392,103	398,674
White-fringed beetle control.....	56,099	299,514	355,613
Army-worm control.....	4,400	11,137	15,537
Total.....	1,170,612	2,823,399	3,994,011

Analysis of estimate for grasshopper control, 1939

General information:	
Total number of States involved.....	22
Total acres of infested cropland.....	30,884,595
Total acres of infested range land (migratorial species).....	17,357,035
Total acres of abandoned infested farm land (migratorial species).....	2,771,671
Total acres infested.....	51,013,301

General information—Continued.

Tons of bait needed to protect crops in farm areas, 140,569 less 40,000 on hand.....	100,569
Tons of bait needed to control migratorial species on abandoned farm and range lands, 65,673 less 15,000 on hand.....	50,673
Total tons of bait needed.....	151,242

Cost of control on farm lands: Purchase and transportation to distribution centers of 100,569 tons of bait material at \$20 per ton (includes administrative and supervisory costs)..... \$2,011,380

This material is unloaded, stored, and mixed by local agencies and distributed on farm lands by farmers.

Cost of control of migratorial species on abandoned farm land and range land in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma:

Purchase and transportation to distribution centers of 50,673 tons of bait material at \$20 per ton (includes administrative and supervisory costs).....	1,013,460
Cost of mixing bait, in addition to local labor and facilities.....	221,092
Cost of hauling bait from mixing stations to field crews, including rental of trucks.....	361,296
Cost of pulling spreaders 1,954,860 miles in spreading bait.....	179,872
Cost of labor required for mixing and distributing bait.....	901,600

Total cost..... 4,688,700

This involves the use of 2,254 bait-spreading machines working 195,486 hours in spreading bait and the employment of 4,508 men.

Analysis of estimate for Mormon-cricket control, 1939

General information:

Total acres infested in 11 States (Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).....	18,919,337
Heavily infested acres needing control to protect crops.....	417,324

Cost of control on 417,324 acres:

Labor for control operations on public and private lands and supplementing farm labor and labor furnished by local agencies.....	\$351,000
Materials, equipment, and supplies supplementing that furnished by local agencies.....	132,605
Technical, supervisory, and administrative expense.....	116,795

Total, Federal cost..... 600,400

Control will involve the use of approximately 300 miles of metal barrier, over 200 power dusters, and 1,000 hand dusters, work to be conducted by approximately 1,500 laborers.

Cost of control to Federal Government will be approximately \$1.45 per acre. The total cost will be approximately \$2.15 per acre; one-third of the total cost is expected to be borne by States and other cooperating agencies as was the case last year.

EXTENT OF AREA TO BE COVERED

Mr. O'NEAL. How much of an area would you cover?

Dr. STRONG. Grasshoppers would cover 24 States, Mormon crickets 11 States.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. What States are they? Can you put the names of the States in the record?

Dr. STRONG. Yes, sir. The grasshopper situation is shown on this map.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"The States where grasshoppers will occur in outbreak numbers in 1939 are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

"The States where Mormon crickets will occur in outbreak numbers in 1939 are: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of a deficiency bill is to provide supplemental appropriations for the operation of the departments that have already been provided for in previous appropriation bills. Such appropriations are intended as emergency measures to piece out the needs of a department or bureau after the regular appropriation has been made. Included in the bill we have before us today is an appropriation for the Department of Labor for the operation and administration of the wage and hour bill.

When the committee had the draft before it, sent up by the Department of Labor, there was tucked into that draft a provision that I think should be called to the attention of

the House, for it indicates an attitude that I believe the House does not approve and which I believe should be criticized.

Those of you who happen to have the hearings before you will note that on page 71 of the hearings the assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Labor, as well as the Administrator of the wage and hour agency, was before the committee for examination. At that time the attention of the administrator was directed to language in the draft of the bill which was sent to the committee providing that the agency could use a part of the fund provided for in this deficiency appropriation for packing, crating, and transporting household goods and effects of its employees.

During the course of the examination on the subject in question, the assistant to the Secretary of Labor finally excused the inclusion of this particular language in the draft sent to the committee with these words:

Would it not be well to raise that as a point of order?

The Administrator and the assistant to the Secretary of Labor both admitted that there was nothing in the existing law giving any authority whatever to the Department or to this agency for the expenditure of funds for this purpose. Pressed for a reason as to why it was included, the suggestion was made that other appropriation bills had carried such an item and therefore this newly created agency felt that it might, too, secure the same privilege, using, however, the subterfuge and the cunning of including it in a deficiency measure rather than waiting until the regular appropriation for that activity came before the Committee on Appropriations.

The amount involved here is not very great, but I do believe that the principle involved is a very material and a very fundamental one. I believe it goes to the matter of good faith of a department in dealing with the Congress. I believe this Congress cannot condone or excuse an assistant to one of the Cabinet officers who suggests that it is perfectly proper to include in the Department's draft of legislation such language as that public official knows to be improper and then gloss it over by saying that it can be eliminated on a point of order. I say the duty of the Department is to send a draft to the committee which the Department knows will not be subject to a point of order. A course of conduct which depends for its standards of honor upon the avoidance of detection of violations of the law indicates a low-water mark in moral competency. Every agency of our Government, and that means those who are responsible for setting the standards of these agencies, should seek to inspire confidence in those with whom they deal, confidence not only in their efficiency, but what is vastly more important, confidence in their integrity of purpose. Perfect candor should prevail. Subterfuge should have no place. And that applies in their dealings with the Congress.

We have been listening too long to the demands of the executive branch of the Government that anything sent here with executive approval must be accepted—must be approved. During the last 5 years executive agencies have been springing up like mushrooms, each of them ambitious and grasping for power. They secure such power by means such as the Department of Labor resorts to here. The motive is clearly indicated in this case, to get by without detection. In effect the assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Labor says, "You should pass or introduce or urge the adoption of legislation which is beyond the rules of the House, and which can be subject to a point of order." If those who are responsible for the submission of estimates to the Congress for appropriations are guilty of the same indifference in determining the financial needs of our Government bureaus as the indifference to the rules and regulations of the House advocated by the assistant to the Secretary of Labor, then no credibility whatever can attach to the justifications upon which all appropriations are based. Such a course casts a shadow of doubt upon the probity of the administration of the Department as a whole and destroys that confidence

without which cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government cannot be maintained. Good faith is a fundamental requisite.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 a new agency was created. This is the agency with which we are dealing. It is under the Department of Labor.

It deals with the relations existing between employer and employee. Utmost good faith in its operation will be necessary if it is to carry out the purposes of the act.

I wonder how the employer or employee or the consumer can be assured that a just and honorable and equitable adjustment of differences will be reached by an agency that suggests that it is right to do something which it knows to be wrong, providing it is not detected. Wait for a point of order is the advice of the assistant, even though we know it is against the rules of the House. What degree of confidence can a wage earner or an employer have in the inspectors and investigators of this agency if this is the code of fair dealing advocated by the Department?

We have heard the President say that he is proud of the reestablishment of spiritual values. Spiritual values do have real worth. Let those values include the old homely virtues of honesty, fair dealing, and integrity of purpose. Let the legislative and executive branches feel that they are dealing with each other open and above board and that the cards are not being stacked under the table. That will go far to reestablish a moral standard which will reflect real spiritual values.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the House will join with me not only in criticism but in censure of any agency of the Government that comes here under the cover of a deficiency appropriation bill, an emergency appropriation, and then tries to cunningly, craftily, adroitly, and with subterfuge slip something into the bill which it knows to be against the rules of the House. Such an attitude cannot be condoned. It deserves criticism and censure. Let us have a little less cunning, a little more candor, a little less craftiness, a little more conscience. Let the executive agencies give us the same measure of good faith as they expect at our hands.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I cannot permit the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] to go unchallenged. He is usually so logical in his thinking and discriminating in his judgment that I actually sat amazed during his diatribe against the wage and hour administration. I never met Mr. Andrews until he appeared before our committee.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman followed me personally, he will know that I directed no attack on Mr. Andrews. The quotation to which I directed the attention of the House was an answer of the assistant to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Saunders. I join the gentleman in having real regard, from what I have been told and what I have observed, for the Administrator of the wage and hour group.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate what the gentleman says, but even that statement of the gentleman puts a different light upon it. The gentleman held up to the committee the departments had "cunningly, craftily," stealthily, tried to slip something into a bill that has no place in the bill. My friend is too sophisticated in parliamentary procedure and in appropriations to feel that way about it. Mr. Richard Saunders, the gentleman referred to, is the Budget officer of the Department of Labor. My friend knows, he should know, he does know, that the language sent to the committee was sent by the Budget Bureau and not by the Department, that the language which comes to the deficiency subcommittee either is prepared by or approved by the Director of the Budget. The Department asked the Budget for \$400,000 more than the Budget recommended. The Budget slashed the figures heavily. The Department asked the Budget to permit them, when they moved their agents from one place of duty to another, to pay a certain amount of the costs incurred by

those employees of the Government in moving from one official post of duty to another—a procedure that is quite common in the Government service, a provision that is carried in many of the appropriation bills, a provision that could have been knocked out many times if anybody had challenged it.

The Army and Navy have that provision; the State Department; all of the bureaus of the Government who have important field officers, who periodically have to be changed from one point to another in their official duties are permitted, by legislation, to pay a portion of the cost of transporting those officers and their goods from one post of duty to another.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. I recognize the long experience of the gentleman and how well informed he is. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not he knows of any instance in which this effort was made in a deficiency bill for a newly created agency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Perhaps not. I am not able to see the significance that the gentleman draws by this matter coming up in a deficiency bill. Deficiency is a name that covers a multitude of things. There is no deficiency connected with the New England hurricane situation.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman will admit, and does, of course, acknowledge that all of the matters in connection with the operation of a department are more clearly inquired into in the regular bill for the operation of that department than when a deficiency bill for that department is before the committee? That is reasonable to assume, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. I cannot admit that. I do not think there is a stronger group in the House than the deficiency subcommittee, headed on the gentleman's side by the industrious and alert gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], augmented now by the discerning services of my friend from Pennsylvania. I think there will be careful inquiry.

Mr. DITTER. I think the gentleman is attempting a construction that he knows I in no sense intended. Headed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, than whom there is no more able man in the House, the deficiency is well manned on the Democratic side, and particularly well managed in the chairmanship, but is there not greater opportunity and more time put in when the regular bill for the Department is before the subcommittee, than during the time that the deficiency matters come before the committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I cannot agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman and I disagree very amiably. May I inquire, is the House to understand that if any criticism attaches to this matter to which I directed the attention of the House, the gentleman feels that criticism should be directed to the Budget officer, rather than the Department of Labor?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think any criticism, in the sense that the gentleman made criticism, is appropriate to anybody. The provision in question was struck out of the bill unanimously when the gentleman called attention to it. I do not think the matter is one which, by the wildest stretch of imagination, could be turned into anything that the gentleman has pictured as an effort of a department or an officer to undertake to put something over on the Congress or the Government.

Mr. DITTER. Are we to understand the gentleman feels that the economies he has so advocated to the House will be advanced if all of the departments, all of the agencies, and all of the bureaus that have sprung up in the last 5 years are permitted to have this privilege of paying the moving expenses of the hordes of New Deal employees?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, I quite agree with the gentleman, and did so in the committee, that it was not a proper provision to go in the bill; but for the life of me I cannot see how the gentleman has worked himself into a

lather over it. He indicts the Department of Labor, indicts the wage and hour administration, and throws suspicion on the whole administrative organization. Perhaps the gentleman did not intend to, but when the gentleman reads his remarks I think that is what he will find.

Mr. DITTER. I in no sense retract. I still feel the impropriety of including in a deficiency bill the language in question, and in the absence of a better explanation than that afforded by either Mr. Saunders or any of those identified with him, with only the explanation that it should be protected by the alertness of the House in taking it out on a point of order, I still stand fast on the censure that I intend to bring to those chargeable with it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his position.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] as far as inserting matters of this kind in appropriation bills is concerned, but I am wondering whether a department that happens to slip these items in, knowing that they are subject to a point of order, is in any different position than the Appropriations Committee which, in every appropriation bill we have before the House, brings before us items of legislation, knowing they are subject to points of order, and yet attempting to let them slip through if that can be done without attracting the attention of the Members. What is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Speaking of a point of order, the gentleman, of course, knows, because he is an alert parliamentarian, that there is an item in this bill in which many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle are interested, that is subject to a point of order—the New England hurricane item. There is no authorization for it in the law.

Are we to impugn the motives of the New England delegation? Are we to impugn the motives of the Bureau of the Budget? Is everybody connected with Congress to doubt these departments and feel that they are trying to put something over on Congress which is subject to a point of order?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman hardly feels that there is justification in drawing an analogy between this hurricane situation and the relationship existing between a department or bureau and the Congress in providing for the regular operations of the department or bureau. The analogy certainly does not hold good.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Perhaps it does not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I think, however, it is perhaps as logical as the position my friend takes that a bureau or department asks the Budget to include certain language, the Budget Bureau does so, the committee finds it and unanimously strikes it out. My friend is greatly agitated about that. It seems to me it puts a very wrong interpretation on a bureau that certainly from my viewpoint made a very creditable showing before the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that the language of that portion of the bill dealing with hurricane damage carries this additional proviso:

That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not apply in the case of any expenditure hereunder where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300.

The usual provision of law in that regard is for purchases not exceeding a certain amount.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was there some purpose in changing that language so that donations on account of storm damage could be made?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the statute cited by the gentleman does not apply to donations. It requires proposed

purchases and contracts for supplies or services to be advertised. We have adopted the practice of exempting small purchases from this requirement of the law.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman desire to use further time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

MIGRATION OF DESTITUTE CITIZENS ACROSS STATE LINES

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, this week the Department of Education of the State of California is requesting our State legislature to appropriate \$750,000 for the education of children of destitute citizens of other States. There are 30,000 of these children, and the financial burden they thrust upon the school districts and the State of California's fine educational system is appalling.

This condition, Mr. Chairman, deplorable as it is, is merely a consequence of the shameful and inadequate treatment now provided in this Nation for the 1,000,000 destitute citizens who are "Stateless", are forced by unbearable standards of living, poverty, health, and debt to cross State lines in an attempt to avoid starvation, and gain the bare necessities of life.

WHAT THE CONGRESS HAS DONE WITH THE PROBLEM

Three years ago the Senate reported a resolution calling for an investigation of the plight of the migratory worker, and by amendment gave the Labor Department the job of investigation without appropriation. A splendid preliminary report was made to the Senate and the Secretary of Labor stated at that time that an appropriation of \$20,000 would be needed to print the report, complete the investigation, and assemble sufficient data to recommend remedial legislation.

The preliminary report of the Secretary of Labor was never printed as a Senate document. It is in my office now, nearly 2 years old, and still not sufficiently complete to be used for the drafting of remedial legislation.

I regret that the Joint Committee on Printing refused to order the publication of this report.

I regret the fact that after the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 85, and it was reported in the House, that we failed to join the Senate at the last Congress in the passage of this resolution granting the Labor Department \$20,000 to complete its work.

HOUSE INVESTIGATION REQUESTED

Today, Mr. Chairman, I am introducing a resolution, which I sincerely trust the Rules Committee will report without delay. It provides that the Speaker appoint a special investigating committee of five members to "inquire into the interstate migration of destitute citizens, to study, survey, and investigate the social and economic needs, and the movement of indigent persons across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the House in enacting remedial legislation."

The purpose of this investigation is simply this: (1) To permit the Secretary of Labor to complete her report, and the various national authorities who put so much time into the preliminary study, to complete their investigation and suggest legislative remedies; (2) to permit public charitable agencies and social-science authorities to add their recommendations to those of the Labor Department; and (3) to print for the use of the committee a selected and authoritative document which will give the Nation and the Congress reliable information on the extent of this problem, and its social implications.

SEEKS INTELLIGENT APPROACH

To carry out the purposes of the resolution I offer today would only involve a minor expense and, in the face of a problem which is every day becoming more acute, an expenditure which is absolutely necessary if the Congress is going to take action.

The transient unemployed are the constituents of no individual Congressman; they are the constituents of the Nation at large. If you cut relief appropriations for their care, no State welfare agency or county charitable organization is

interested in the nonresident application. So I say that it is time that the Congress set about approaching this problem intelligently, instead of bouncing our "Stateless," homeless, and poverty-stricken citizens from one committee to another, while throughout the Nation they are bounced from one State to another.

SERIOUS PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY

Mr. Chairman, I should like to list briefly for the House the principal problems which necessitate study by the proposed committee:

1. Interstate nature of the migratory problem

California, as we all know, is the hardest hit by the western migration of families who have suffered from drought or other economic setbacks in the Midwest. We have 900,000 persons who receive some form of relief in our State, and the non-resident-relief load for the last 3 years has increased by 100,000 indigent Dust Bowl refugees each year for 3 years.

The Nation as a whole has been affected. Before the program of work relief was adopted, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration gave \$90,000,000 in direct Federal aid to these people. Now the policy of the Government has been to divert the handling of these cases to the W. P. A. and the Farm Security Administration on a rigidly curtailed program.

However, the following States are suffering from a serious influx of these destitute families: New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, District of Columbia, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Texas, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and California. And the rest of the States have no machinery or appropriations to provide for these families when they are stranded.

2. The problem of health

Forty-two percent of the cases in the Kern County Hospital in California for last year involved the treatment of nonresident patients. This is another serious financial burden upon the county. Local agencies alone cannot control the spreading of tuberculosis and venereal diseases by these infected migrants. Children suffer from malnutrition and exposure, and the normal community facilities are not available for these outcasts in any State, except in extreme emergency.

3. The problem of labor

Wage scales of 20 cents per hour and less in the Southwest are very common. In California, where we pay agricultural workers on the average of 50 cents an hour, this influx of workers is driving our wage scales down. A starving man will work for food, and the labor department survey shows that he will work for any salary, no matter how small. In California today there are four workers in the field for every position, and the number of jobs for this seasonal income is being slashed because of the national crop curtailment program.

4. The problem of education

These children are entitled to education, and that is the opinion of the California educational authorities. They need both academic instruction and vocational education. Many States will not attempt to see that these children, who are nonresidents, go to school. We give direct student aid through the National Youth Administration, but I feel that a portion of such funds should be set aside for the homeless transient waif that, because of real handicaps of life, is in greater need of education than those children in good homes.

5. The legal problem

Laws relating to residence in the various States are popularly designated "settlement laws." They work great hardship on persons forced to move. There is no uniformity, and in some States merely crossing the border means loss of citizenship, while in others a year's absence cuts off all claim to residence. In California a person under law cannot receive county relief unless a resident of that county 3 years; nor State relief unless a resident 1 year; nor W. P. A. unless the State certifies that the person is a resident. Thus these Stateless persons are fed and clothed illegally by our counties and by the State, and the W. P. A., while the Farm Security Administration assists them to remain in the State

long enough to demand State and county relief as citizens. When they get on the W. P. A. they send for the rest of their relatives in the Midwestern States and help them keep alive in California with Federal funds until they too may demand relief.

WHAT TRANSIENTS NEED

Mr. Chairman, these 1,000,000 Stateless citizens of our country need help today in the following forms: First, relief provisions, clothing, and shelter; second, medical aid and instruction in hygiene; third, accurate information as to possibility of employment in other States where migratory workers are needed for seasonal crops; fourth, educational facilities for the children, particularly vocational training; and fifth, uniform treatment in all States with a Federal agency responsible for their treatment and the earmarking of special funds from relief appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, at a later date I will address the House further on this subject, but I request at this time that Members of the House that are interested in this problem join with those of us who regard this as a problem more important to the Nation as a whole than to my State, or any particular State now caring, in many cases illegally, for the citizens of other States. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, since the district I have the honor to represent is located in the San Joaquin Valley of California, the area to which so many unfortunate transients have migrated in recent years, I am more than ordinarily interested in the proposal offered by my colleague, Mr. TOLAN.

During the past several years California's treasury has been drained, its relief administrators harassed by demands impossible of fulfillment, and its private citizens constantly called upon to supplement an all too inadequate Government relief. Even California's famed hospitality is now strained to the breaking point.

According to Mr. Thomas W. McManus, secretary of the California Citizens' Association, over 300,000 indigent migrants have come to California in the last 2 years. As a consequence of a survey conducted by this organization, it was discovered that, contrary to popular belief, these transients are not migratory farm laborers fitted for specialized farm work in California. Rather, they are farm and share-crop families displaced, through no fault of their own, by drought, depression, and crop curtailment—good people who have come to California in the slim hope of obtaining some sort of subsistence to tide them over from day to day.

This migration has brought the State's daily relief load to 900,000. There are four agricultural workers for every single available job; and should a further crop-curtailment program be levied upon California agriculture, this ratio will reach disastrous proportions.

Time does not permit a detailed account of the misery occasioned by this optimistic migration. Because of fierce labor competition, the wage structure has been threatened with collapse. Large families have been forced to use cardboard shacks as places of permanent abode. Squatter camps have sprung up in numberless locations, a constant threat to the public health.

True, State, Federal, and private relief organizations have attempted to cope with the problem, but the ever-increasing burden is now too much for State and local authority to bear.

Even if this perplexing problem could be solved by relief agencies, the result would be merely a temporary palliative. A long-range plan looking to a permanent solution is necessary, and I confidently believe that if the House should adopt the resolution proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], a long step will have been taken in the right direction. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations at this time in connection with the wage and hour division which is under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the bill, but I feel that in justice to Administrator Andrews and Mr. Magruder that those who opposed the bill should say a word in their behalf for the genuine, common horse sense which I feel they are using in administering the act. I am certain that if the vote were to be taken again I would vote against the bill as I did before; but, as I observe and check on the situation, I feel that the services, or the administration of these gentlemen whom I have mentioned, is so far above and beyond that of the National Labor Relations Board that Members of Congress should recognize the high type of administration which is being given by these two gentlemen.

The difficulty that I want to call to the attention of the House at this moment is something that may prove to be a disastrous defect in the act in that contingent liabilities are being piled up every day on the industries of this country; that is, against their capital structures which may at some future time precipitate a situation as embarrassing to public accountants, bankers, stockholders, and all others involved as has the Musica-Coster, McKesson-Robbins proposition.

It is practically impossible for an accountant to examine the books of an institution which has hundreds of employees and then certify as to the responsibility, or financial obligation, which that company has to the employees under the Wage and Hour Division with reference to the time-and-a-half, or overtime, liability which is piling up. If a concern makes the payment without knowing that the law holds that the liability exists, and it finds later that the liability does not exist, the stockholders have been deprived of equities in the concern, because the payment was made although the law did not require it. If the firm runs on for weeks, months, and years and then does find that the liability exists, some accounting firm may be severely criticized for having certified to the financial balance sheets to banks and other lending institutions that the company had no liability under the act and later find that the assets must be decreased by the amount of the liability which runs by reason of some court decision. I think this Congress at the appropriate time should amend the law and set a date beyond which such liability shall not run against the company.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. We all appreciate that the gentleman has had expert training as an accountant and that he knows what he is talking about in this particular. What length of time does the gentleman think would be the proper limit to place?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am just going to make the observation that when you set the date you put into effect a stop-gap against the interest of the employee. In other words, why should I as an employee be deprived of my time and a half for overtime if the law grants it to me?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the rights of the employee are recognized as this act, I think, did recognize on this particular point, then you cannot recognize the right of the industrial concern, or the capital structure, we will say. So I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question except in an arbitrary manner; that is to say, to make the period, say, 1 or 2. Even if you run 2 years, in the case of a company with a weak capital structure and a large number of employees, or even with just a weak capital structure, when the law takes effect and the liability is established and the company must pay, there is serious danger that you destroy the capital structure of the company.

For other reasons, as well as this one, I voted against the act. I believe that in due course unless we change it very materially, we will find that the act will result in the financial collapse of a great many institutions when the force of the law becomes operative.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS].

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, this being my maiden trip down to the Well of this House, I should like to confine my comments to a subject about which I know something. I should like to speak about the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., because in the great catastrophe that has occurred in New England the value and the importance of our great laboratory manifests itself, and when I say "our great laboratory" I include all of the Members of the Congress and all of the States of the Union, because the services of this laboratory are not in any way limited or restricted to Wisconsin and the States immediately adjacent thereto.

I believe the laboratory operating at Madison, Wis., under the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture, the Director, and all of the employees of that laboratory would be more than happy and more than willing to extend all of the facilities of the laboratory to this stricken area in its rehabilitation. I do not believe, however, that the people in that particular area, or the Members of Congress representing the various districts of these United States, have a true appreciation of the equipment contained in this laboratory.

This laboratory has developed portable sawmills which could be used in the stricken area at the present time. It has other equipment that could be moved up there. It has technical devices that could be used in the proper handling of all the timber that is down. May I suggest to the Committee and to the House that perhaps a small amount of money included in this \$3,000,000 deficiency appropriation measure be allotted and earmarked for the Forest Products Laboratory, with the idea in mind that their technical help and material assistance be placed on the field immediately.

Mr. Winslow, the Director, has indicated to me he would like to go up there, that he would like to send his men up there and that he would like to have all of the facilities of the laboratory put to work in the above-mentioned stricken area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did Mr. Winslow speak at the New England council regarding forests?

Mr. HAWKS. He was up there.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think he made very fine recommendations.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, according to Mr. Winslow's statement, in 1928 and since then there has been recommended for the Forest Products Laboratory an appropriation of \$1,000,000, but never has that amount been appropriated. Last year I believe the sum was \$628,000.

Mr. Chairman, this laboratory needs the million dollars. This is one part of our Government which is performing a real service and I do not hesitate a minute in coming before this House and recommending that the full million dollars asked for by the Department of Agriculture be appropriated to this particular division of the Government. It is performing a service that benefits everyone in this country. It has developed uses for forest products that have proved of value to various people in this country, those interested, for example, in the building game and those who are interested in building homes but find themselves confronted with high costs.

I should like to have the Committee specifically recommend that a part of this \$3,000,000, say at least fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, be earmarked and set aside for the Forest Products Laboratory for use in the particular area at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that

that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence and to include a statement to the President and the reply by the President on that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech of Governor James of Pennsylvania. The Public Printer has advised me that this exceeds two and a half pages of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to insert this speech of Governor James, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman secured an estimate from the Public Printer?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. The Public Printer's estimate is \$112.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered in the previous session of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very fine brief presented to the board of hospitalization 2 days ago in favor of a general medical, surgical, and diagnostic center for Boston or the metropolitan area and also to include certain other material in favor of the hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the entire Massachusetts delegation and a number of the Senators and Representatives from other New England States appeared before the board of hospitalization requesting that the board grant money for a hospital at Boston or in the metropolitan area of Boston. For 20 years and over, especially since 1925, Mr. Speaker, I have plead with the Veterans' Administration to build such a hospital in metropolitan Boston. We have the finest medical staff in the entire country, although I appreciate other people have very fine medical men in their districts. We have a tremendously large veteran population. We sent a great many men to the World War and many to the Spanish-American War. Everyone knows the part the old Sixth Regiment played in the Civil War.

Our veterans should be properly cared for with a diagnostic center. We all know that if you have a diagnostic center and a general medical and surgical hospital in connection with a veterans' hospital, staffed by fine physicians, with fine outside consultants, the veterans receive better care and their cases may be service-connected more readily; and it is also true the men do very much better when they are near home.

Also, it is less expensive than sending patients hundreds of miles away for hospitalization outside the State.

I am extremely grateful to Captain Kirby, the legislative counsel of the Disabled American Veterans, who has helped constantly and persistently during the past years in fighting for this hospital. He has represented the Disabled American Veterans, who are, of course, the ones primarily interested in such a hospital.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have also been very helpful and their brief, filed 2 days ago, I believe, with the board of hospitalization, will carry great weight. The American Legion has also been helpful. The brief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Boston, Mass., November 26, 1938.

To All Congressmen and Senators:

If we could only communicate to you our intense interest in the erection of a general medical hospital in Boston, we would have gone far on the road to our objective. Even though on two different occasions we have set forth cold, indisputable facts that buttress our convictions, we want you to know that this is not simply agitation from a veterans' organization; that the facts became known after we had entered on our mission and not the cause of our seeking the establishment of the hospital.

We knew the hospital was and had been needed, and then followed the search to see whether or not Massachusetts could be justified in requesting the location of such a facility here. We feel that we have made out a case for Boston. We express the firm conviction that Massachusetts is entitled to have its program of hospitalization carried out here and any permanent allocation of general medical beds otherwise would bring unsatisfactory results.

The subject is continuously being reexamined and we give you herewith the results of a survey made as of October 1, 1938, of the population of the Veterans' Administration facilities of New England:

	Total patient load	Massa- chusetts	Rhode Island	Maine	New Hamp- shire	Ver- mont	Connect- icut
Bedford.....	1,215	865	105	109	78	11	24 NP
Northampton.....	702	390	49	30	30	45	140 NP
Togus.....	1,042	387	63	224	37	15	57 D
Newington.....	189	19	8	111	15	3	2 GM
Rutland.....	186	46	18	1	9	117	GM
	396	123	10	3	29	1	4 GM
		143	17	13	5	3	86 TB

You will note from these figures that the State with the greatest number of men receiving general medical treatment in any State other than their own is Massachusetts. You will also see that Massachusetts leads in the number of men receiving domiciliary care and they have to go to Maine for that. The ratio of out of State N. P. cases continues so that the Bedford facility is roughly equal to the number of Massachusetts men hospitalized for this disability and consequently the additional number of beds in the Northampton facility is for the hospitalization of veterans from other States—Massachusetts hospitalization in location only.

If we seem to be unduly urging action, it is only because we realize that the time is growing short for arrangements for next year, the regular appropriation bills will be considered by the House Appropriations Committee in December. Surely we can expect that our national representatives will press for a meeting of the Federal board of hospitalization before December 1 of this year, and have the decision of the board on record prior to the hearings on next year's Budget.

Today's headlines:

"Great defense program planned at Washington."

"Mass airplane production, larger Navy, power works due to crisis abroad."

There is contained in these headlines every reason for a general medical hospital in Boston and the last reference to Chelsea being considered as available for veterans in the not too distant future.

We have sought your aid, calling to mind oft-repeated statements we have heard of the importance of our Representatives and Senators in Washington, chairmen of important committees, ranking minority leader, ranking minority Member, important member of Ways and Means Committee, member of powerful Appropriations Committee. All of these, indicative of influence and prestige and to you we entrusted our cause, supported with the best evidence for the Massachusetts disabled soldier, sailor, and marine of quondam service, and so we ask you:

How long are you going to let veterans of western Massachusetts be sent 120 miles to the Bronx hospital in New York for all eye, ear, nose, and throat periods of hospitalization?

How long must western Massachusetts veterans with a service-connected N. P. disability be forced to go to Northampton facility for general medical treatment; Newington not admitting such cases?

How long must Massachusetts men be forced to go to Bronx hospital for cancer treatment and to Tupper Lake, N. Y., for lung operations?

When Boston is the medical center of the United States but not for veterans;

And Massachusetts ranks sixth in the contribution of her sons for World War service;

And Boston is the ninth largest city in the country;

And Massachusetts is eighth among the States in population;

And Massachusetts is thirty-ninth in consideration from the Veterans' Administration for supplying general medical beds under its aegis;

And when is the Federal board going to consider Massachusetts general medical needs?

Yours in comradeship,

THE HOSPITAL FOR BOSTON COMMITTEE.
By FRANCIS X. COTTER, Chairman.

The statement of the Disabled American Veterans and of the American Legion will follow later.

I shall be extremely grateful, and I know the veteran population of all New England will be very grateful to the Members if they will bear this situation in mind if they have an opportunity to speak to the members of the board of hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, in my work with the veterans and in the work of hospitalization I have never favored one section of the country over another. I believe the veterans of every section should be served. In the matter of a general medical and surgical hospital we have not been given our share. We have no Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital in the great metropolitan district of Boston. I shall be extremely glad to help any and all other Members in securing proper hospitalization for their veterans. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by printing an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PATRICK, for Friday and Saturday, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 20, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 24, 1939. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Commissioner Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is expected to be the first witness.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Wednesday morning, February 1, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social security legislation, in the Ways and Means committee room of the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

294. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain aircraft parts and instruments or aeronautical accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

295. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the purchase of equipment and supplies for experimental and test purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

296. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the disposal of cemetery lots; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

297. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

298. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2868. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Mary E. Spinney; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

A bill (H. R. 2672) for the relief of Paul Edmond Beliveau; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2674) granting a pension to Samuel Harris; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2678) granting a pension to Fordyce Tucker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2679) for the relief of William Henry Savage; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

H. R. 2868. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 2869. A bill to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 2870. A bill to provide for the acquisition of drydock facilities for the United States Maritime Commission at Los Angeles Harbor, in the city and county of Los Angeles, and to authorize the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a graving dock at Los Angeles Harbor, in the city and county of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 2872. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than the cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 2874. A bill to provide that pensions otherwise payable for a child of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall continue until the child reaches the age of 21, where he is attending accredited school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2875. A bill to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2876. A bill to provide that the widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans who were suffering with permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would be payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action in such service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2877. A bill to provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expedition veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2878. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2879. A bill to amend section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2880. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 2881. A bill to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAPES:

H. R. 2882. A bill to incorporate the National Society—Army of the Philippines as a body corporate of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

H. R. 2883. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado:

H. R. 2884. A bill to appropriate moneys for construction work on reservoirs on the Rio Grande and Conejos Rivers in Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois:

H. R. 2885. A bill to provide for a term of court at Edwardsville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 2886. A bill to impose taxes on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2887. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence

and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2888. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2889 (by request). A bill to provide that the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment shall be entitled to the same pensions, under the same conditions otherwise, as provided for the widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2890. A bill to create a division of water pollution control in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 2891. A bill to grant pensions and increases of pensions to widows and children and other dependents of veterans who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, active military or naval service in the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2892. A bill to provide uniform reciprocal hospitalization in any Army or Navy hospital for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2893. A bill to remove discriminations against retired Army enlisted personnel and to equalize hospitalization and domiciliary benefits of retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2894. A bill to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 2895. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761), authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2896. A bill to readjust the allowances of retired enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2897. A bill to equalize the pensions payable to the dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment with those payable to dependents of veterans of the World War whose death is due to service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2898 (by request). A bill to reclassify salaries of employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department and in the custodial service of the Treasury Department of the United States, including all positions therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 2899. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, issue silver certificates, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, 9 p. m., known as the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 127, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Thomas E. Watson for his services in the origination of Rural Free Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILL:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Ericson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 17 to 23, 1939, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to provide for the purchase and sale of timber in the New England hurricane-stricken area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con Res. 5. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2, on Investigation of Un-American Activities and Propaganda; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. Con Res. 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Will Rogers; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 62. Resolution authorizing the payment of mileage for each clerk to each Representative or Delegate in Congress during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. Res. 63. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate the interstate migration of destitute citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2900. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of David T. Beck; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2901. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Geraldine Ash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Eugene Jacob Steiner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Jake C. Aaron and Thomas W. Carter, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Peter Koutsaymanes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Edmund L. Moore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2906. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2907. A bill granting an increase of pension to Addie Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2908. A bill granting an increase of pension to Arzila A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2909. A bill granting an increase of pension to C. Cordella Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2910. A bill granting an increase of pension to Louisa C. Ludwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2911. A bill granting an increase of pension to Forrest E. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2912. A bill granting an increase of pension to Phoebe C. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2913. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jennie Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2914. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Luella McEwen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2915. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maryette Vannatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2916. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2917. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Dolaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 2918. A bill granting a pension to Arthur Leonard Wadsworth 3d; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Marie K. Trottnow; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Paul Lindley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWELL:

H. R. 2921. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Westlake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Owen J. Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTER of New York:

H. R. 2923. A bill granting a pension to Emil J. Dahlman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2924. A bill granting a pension to Cora Rodell Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Julia Santiago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Bernard Woodruff; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 2927. A bill granting an increase of pension to America E. Dye; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Anton Kostiuk (Anthony Kostiuk); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 2929. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of the estate of Morris Farash; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 2931. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Claud Mead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2934. A bill granting a pension to Jacob J. Short; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Hunter C. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2936. A bill granting a pension to James A. G. Livingston; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2937. A bill granting a pension to Alfred Arrowood; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2938. A bill for the relief of James A. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of M. F. Powers; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of W. S. Rosenbalm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2941. A bill granting a pension to Martha Samsel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2942. A bill granting a pension to Dona Samples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Jos. Greenspon's Son Pipe Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Jerome Scalione; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of certain persons for obtaining purchase options on real estate in slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects in East St. Louis, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Naoma Kinder, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of the West Virginia Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Morris Hoppenheim, Lena Hoppenheim, Doris Hoppenheim, and Ruth Hoppenheim; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2949. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2950. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Samuel F. Swayne; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2951. A bill directing the payment to William H. Carter of travel allowances from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 2952. A bill granting a pension to Henry J. Esch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

301. By Mr. BALL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Durham, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation to prevent, as far as possible, the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

302. Also, petition of certain citizens of Stonington, Conn., having reference to the general policy of neutrality to be pursued by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. Also, petitions of citizens of Rockville, and citizens of Jewett City, all of the State of Connecticut, requesting that we adhere to the general policy of neutrality now in force in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

304. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of the citizens of Monroe, Wis., and vicinity, requesting that we adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

305. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Neuaukum Home Grange, No. 622, Enumclaw, Wash., Mrs. L. C. Fant, secretary, Auburn, Wash., pointing out that the agriculture crisis continues; that dairy farmers in western Washington are badly hit; that farmers generally are faced with foreclosure and in such cases would be compelled to go on relief; that in view of agricultural conditions generally it is urged that Congress pass an act to suspend payments on the principal farm loans as was done up to last year; that such suspension continue until such time as the agricultural situation improves; to the Committee on Agriculture.

306. By Mr. DeROUEN: Petition of the St. Joseph's Holy Name Society, Ponchatoula, La., protesting against the lifting of the so-called Spanish embargo and urging the adherence by the United States to its present neutrality policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

307. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of Lewis E. Keith and others of Swampscott, Mass., urging that the Dies committee be reappointed to continue its investigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

308. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, Fitchburg, Mass., to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal taxes upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

309. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, Boston, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

310. Also, petition of the Clare Circle, No. 69, National Circle, Daughters of Isabella, Whitinsville, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

311. Also, petition of the Court St. Jude, No. 1123, Catholic Daughters of America, Charlestown, Mass., opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

312. Also, petition of the Scandinavian Workers League of America, Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

313. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by Julian Wolfe, David Doar, and Clyde Fair, committee on behalf of Thomas Raysor Summers Post, No. 4, American Legion, Orangeburg, S. C., urging that Representatives in the National Congress be requested to pass such legislation as will better protect the people of this Nation, and at the same time have on hand enough of the latest type firearms and munitions so that should another war come upon us this country will be in a better position to protect its property and its citizens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

314. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Reynolds, Ind., and vicinity, submitting a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. Also, petition of members of All Saints Church, San Pierre, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

316. Also, petitions of citizens of Star City, Lafayette, and North Judson, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy in respect to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

317. Also, petition of citizens of Kewanna, Ind., submitting a declaration of policy in respect to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

318. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of 149 residents of Wichita, Kans., and vicinity, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

319. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Grace Fitzgerald and other residents of Sheffield, Pa., asking Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

320. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of the Reverend J. A. Szuprijl and 82 other residents of Peshtigo, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

321. Also, petition of Dr. N. J. McLaughlin and 19 other residents of Wrightstown, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

322. Also, petition of Roscoe T. Page and sundry citizens of Appleton, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United

States to retain provisions of the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937, and also to retain the embargo on arms and to investigate leftist and communistic groups in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

323. Also, petition of the St. Ann's congregation and 16 other residents of Francis Creek, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

324. Also, petition of Rev. John H. Huhn and 44 other residents of Luxemburg, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

325. Also, petition of Judge G. H. Crowns and the signatures of 18 residents of Kewaunee, Wis., urging adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

326. Also, petition of Frank Schmitt and 19 other residents of Greenleaf, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

327. Also, petition of the Reverend Vincent Cottam, pastor of the St. Mary of the Lake Catholic Church, Baileys Harbor, Wis., and 19 other citizens of Baileys Harbor, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

328. Also, petition of the Reverend H. A. Littel and 219 other residents of Green Bay, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; and to keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, petition of Joe Gunschevich and 19 other residents of Combined Locks, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and as amended in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

330. Also, petition of the Reverend L. C. Becker and 19 other citizens of Oconto, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended in the act of May 1, 1937, to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

331. Also, petition of John Goodland, Jr., mayor, and 29 other residents of Appleton, Wis., petitioning the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

332. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Telegram from the American Federation of Musicians, Local 802, New York City, urging support for adequate appropriations for the arts and Federal theater projects in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

333. Also, petition of the Walnut Hill Realty Corporation, New York City, concerning the Patman chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. Also, petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, Borough Hall Lodge, No. 222, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

335. By Mr. KINZER: Petitions of 39 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., setting forth a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

336. Also, petition of certain citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging consideration of a petition with reference to advertising and the sale of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. Also, petition of certain citizens of Marietta, Pa., protesting against any change in our neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

338. Also, petition of the faculty and students of Immaculata College, in the Tenth District of Pennsylvania, protesting against any change in our neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

339. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of the members of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Market Square Presbyterian Church, of Harrisburg, favoring the retention of the embargo on munitions to countries engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

340. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Four County Council, composed of commercial organizations of Grant, Okanogan, Douglas, and Chelan Counties, of the State of Washington, expressing the opposition of this group to the proposed establishment of a national park in the Cascade Range, it being contended that there is already set aside in the State of Washington adequate areas for park and recreational facilities and that it would not be in the best interests of the State to preclude development of mineral, timber, water power, grazing, and hunting resources in that area; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

341. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Michigan favoring the policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of Congress of August 31, 1935, and also the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

342. Also, petition of the members of the Holy Name Society of the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Oakwood Boulevard, Detroit, Mich., opposing the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

343. Also, resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., opposing taxation of State and municipal securities by the Federal Government without consent of the State, and urging support of legislation prohibiting retroactive Federal taxation of salaries of State and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

344. Also, petition of the International Association of Fire Fighters, Local Union No. 356, Wyandotte, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to preventing the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, resolution of Wyandotte Council, No. 1802, Knights of Columbus, urging the continuation of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities and sufficient appropriation to enable the committee to function and perform its services; to the Committee on Rules.

346. Also, resolution of the State, County, and Municipal Workers Local 79, Detroit, Mich., opposing any amendment to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

347. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of the citizens of Clyde, Ohio, urging adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retaining on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

348. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Hugh L. Garrity and sundry citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging Congress to adhere to the general

policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and to retain the further and corollary principle of the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

349. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the St. Joan of Arc's Holy Name Society, of Jackson Heights, resolving that this society respectfully demand of the Congress of the United States to continue its policy of strict neutrality on behalf of the people of this Nation and to prevent the exportation of arms from this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

350. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of Mrs. Charles Cross and eight other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

351. Also, petition of John P. McCotter and 23 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

352. Also, petition of Louise Owens and 23 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

353. Also, petition of Robert Burkett and 19 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

354. Also, petition of Mrs. T. Powers and 17 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. Also, petition of H. J. Binck, Jr., and 18 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

356. Also, petition of John A. Moos and 35 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

357. Also, petition of Mary J. O'Connor and 20 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the neutrality acts passed by the Congress of the United States on August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

358. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Kane, Pa., favoring the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. By Mr. SANDAGER: Memorial of the members of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, Providence, R. I., urging maintenance of the embargo on munition shipments to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

360. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of parishoners of St. Elizabeth's parish, East St. Louis, Ill., calling upon Congress to retain on the statute books the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, and extend its provisions to include civil and international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

361. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Marion-Taylor Chapter, of the Department of West Virginia, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Fairmont, W. Va., favoring the continuation of hearings on un-American activities by the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

362. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Rev. T. A. Rankin and 75 citizens of Virginia, protesting against the lifting of the Spanish embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

363. By Mr. THORKELOSON: Petition of the State wheat committee (Montana), petitioning Congress to appropriate a total of \$6,000,000 for the control of insects of regional importance, which appropriation shall be administered by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, of the Department of Agriculture; and that said appropriation be made in sufficient time so that proper preparations can be made for the control program this spring; to the Committee on Appropriations.

364. Also, petition of the Northern Montana Development Association, requesting that there be no acreage control applied to the production of sugar beets; that the production of sugar beets be encouraged in all areas where the crop may be produced successfully in order to divert acreage of surplus producing crops, such as wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco; and urging adequate sugar-beet legislation that will permit the further development of the irrigation resources of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

365. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Libby, Mont., requesting that the parts of the act of March 4, 1907, and the act of August 24, 1912, which prevent the President from making changes in the national forests of Montana, be repealed to enable an extension of the Kootenai National Forest to include the Kootenai Canyon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

366. Also, petition of the county commissioners of Beaverhead County, Mont., requesting the enactment of a work relief law to divert labor back to private industry and relieve the present relief rolls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

367. Also, petition of the Butte branch of the American Association of University Women, requesting revision of the neutrality law in certain respects; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

368. Also, petition of the Helena Teamsters Union, Local No. 666, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the modification of the National Labor Relations Act and favoring increase of the annual appropriation for enforcement of the act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

369. Also, petition of the Northeast Montana Production Credit Association, requesting that the farm bill be amended or a new bill be passed establishing a bushelage quota for farmer-producers, with a set parity price for wheat based on 12-percent protein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

370. Also, petition of the Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly, opposing any modification in the National Labor Relations Act, and petitioning an increased appropriation to carry on the work; to the Committee on Labor.

371. Also, petition of the Northern Montana Development Association, requesting an increase of the appropriation for the insect (grasshopper) control work of the Bureau of Entomology to \$6,000,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

372. Also, petition of the Farm Rate Council, of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, suggesting certain provisions involving production of farm rates and coordination of railroad facilities in proposed railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

373. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Rev. John E. O'Connor and others, of Altoona, Pa., urging adherence by the United States to the Neutrality Acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

374. Also, petition of Altoona Council 551, Knights of Columbus, of Altoona, Pa., urging the adherence by the United States to the policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

375. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert A. Greiner, of Altoona, Pa., urging United States adherence to the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, and to retain on our statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts, urging Congress to launch an investigation of those leftist groups which are sponsoring propaganda favoring lifting of the embargo on arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

376. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Petition of M. Louise Lavalla, Financier Council No. 3471, the Security Benefit Association, Buhl, Idaho, urging the passage of an amendment to the Social Security Act, exempting subordinate councils or lodges of fraternal benefit societies and their officers from the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

377. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Anthony's Church, Joliet, Ill., protesting against the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

378. Also, petition of A. P. Robert, Marquette, Mich., petitioning in favor of neutrality and keeping the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

379. Also, petition of John Cappio, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa., urging consideration of a petition with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

380. Also, petition of Mrs. Matilde A. Wild, Clarion, Pa., petitioning the keeping of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

381. Also, petition of John Kish, Elrama, Pa., and others, petitioning the keeping of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

382. Also, petition of the Women's National Democratic Club, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted January 15, 1939, with reference to an elective third term; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1939

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 17, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 19, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	La Follette	Russell
Andrews	Ellender	Lee	Schwartz
Ashurst	Frazier	Lewis	Schwellenbach
Austin	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Bailey	Gerry	Logan	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gibson	Lucas	Smithers
Barbour	Gillette	Lundeen	Smith
Barkley	Glass	McCarran	Stewart
Bilbo	Green	McKellar	Taft
Bone	Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Mead	Tobey
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Townsend
Burke	Hatch	Minton	Truman
Byrd	Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Herring	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Norris	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Nye	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	King	Reed	
Davis		Reynolds	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained from the Senate because of illness. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is detained on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF PAUL Y. ANDERSON AND RODNEY DUTCHER

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, since the final adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress Messrs. Paul Y. Anderson and Rodney Dutcher, who were long distinguished, respected, and